









HAS THE IMMIGRANT  
KEPT THE FAITH?



THE MACMILLAN COMPANY  
NEW YORK • BOSTON • CHICAGO • DALLAS  
ATLANTA • SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED  
LONDON • BOMBAY • CALCUTTA  
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.  
TORONTO

277.3  
Sh2

# HAS THE IMMIGRANT KEPT THE FAITH?

A STUDY OF IMMIGRATION AND  
CATHOLIC GROWTH IN THE UNITED STATES  
1790-1920

BY

GERALD SHAUGHNESSY, S.M., A.B., S.T.D.

FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, MARIST COLLEGE, WASHINGTON, D. C., AND  
NOTRE DAME SEMINARY, NEW ORLEANS.

New York  
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY  
1925

*All rights reserved*

COPYRIGHT, 1925,  
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and printed.  
Published December, 1925.

Printed in the United States of America by  
J. J. LITTLE AND IVES COMPANY, NEW YORK

79  
81 - 22265 - 64

**Nihil Obstat**

N. A. WEBER, S.M., S.T.D.

*Censor Deputatus*

**Imprimi Potest**

R. H. SMITH, S.M.

*Provincialis*

**Nihil Obstat**

C. F. AIKEN, S.T.D.

*Censor Deputatus*

**Imprimatur**

✠ M. J. CURLEY, D.D.

*Archiepiscopus Baltimorensis*

January 20, 1925.



DEDICATED TO  
THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY  
THE AMERICAN PRIESTS  
AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLES  
WHO  
UNDER THE GUIDANCE OF THE HOLY SEE  
BUILDED THE CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES  
BETTER THAN THEY KNEW



## PREFACE

The Catholic Church in the United States is not so young that some hoary legends have not attached themselves to her history. For a full century and more Catholic literature, when it touches upon the subject, has, almost without exception, propagated the statement that the Church in the United States has been a failure, because of the loss to the faith of millions of immigrants.

So frequent is the allegation that the Church in the United States has suffered enormous losses through defection from the faith, and yet so widely at variance with each other are the various statements attempting to estimate those losses, that a spirit of inquisitiveness led me to take up the study of the subject. I had no preconceived ideas on the subject except that I did not question the traditional view. My intent was not to combat this view, but simply to measure the loss which was almost unanimously alleged.

To this investigation have been devoted the spare moments of the past four years and over, and in the desire for accuracy the mathematical calculations involved have been made four separate times, each independently of the others. The fact that there was in all the computations practically no variation in the results arrived at is somewhat of a guarantee of the acceptability of these results. My surprise at the conclusion to which this investigation has led was no less than will be that of any reader who has always accepted the "traditional" attitude on this subject.

That so unscientific an attitude as the traditional view really is should have persisted for so many decades practically without being challenged is explainable only as the old fallacy of blind reliance on the "*argumentum ex auctoritate*." Repeat anything often enough and it will find acceptance; persist in the repetition and the acceptance will become unhesitating and unquestioned. History, unfortunately, is replete with illuminating examples of the truth of this. I may be permitted to indulge the hope that the present work paves the way for a saner and more scientific view of the religious condition of the immigrant, and the growth of the Church, in the United States.

My sincere thanks are due to many friends who by advice and suggestions have aided me in the present work. To the Very Rev. N. A. Weber, S.M., S.T.D., Rector of Marist College, Washington, D. C., and Dr. Henry Jones Ford, Emeritus Professor of Politics, Princeton University, and President of the American

## PREFACE

Catholic Historical Association, who read the manuscript from the viewpoint of the historian, and to Constantine E. McGuire, K.S.G., Ph.D., who favored me with constructive criticism and advice from the statistical point of view, I am especially grateful.

GERALD SHAUGHNESSY

May 19, 1925.

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE . . . . .	9
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	17
CHAPTER I	
INTRODUCTORY . . . . .	29
CHAPTER II	
CATHOLICITY IN THE COLONIES TO 1790 . . . . .	36
CHAPTER III	
THE CHURCH IN 1790 . . . . .	53
CHAPTER IV	
CATHOLIC GROWTH FROM 1790 TO 1820 . . . . .	63
CHAPTER V	
A GENERAL SURVEY OF AMERICAN IMMIGRATION: ITS SOURCES; ITS CAUSES . . . . .	74
CHAPTER VI	
GROSS IMMIGRATION AND NET POPULATION GAIN . . . . .	92
CHAPTER VII	
THE PERCENTAGE OF CATHOLICS AMONG IMMIGRANTS TO THE UNITED STATES . . . . .	106
CHAPTER VIII	
CATHOLIC GROWTH FROM 1820 TO 1850 . . . . .	113
I. 1820 TO 1830 . . . . .	113
II. 1831 TO 1840 . . . . .	119
III. 1841 TO 1850 . . . . .	126
CHAPTER IX	
CATHOLIC GROWTH FROM 1850 TO 1870 . . . . .	137
I. 1851 TO 1860 . . . . .	137
II. 1861 TO 1870 . . . . .	146

## CONTENTS

## CHAPTER X

	PAGE
CATHOLIC GROWTH FROM 1870 TO 1920 . . . . .	155
I. 1871 TO 1880 . . . . .	155
II. 1881 TO 1890 . . . . .	162
III. 1891 TO 1900 . . . . .	167
IV. 1901 TO 1910 . . . . .	172
V. 1911 TO 1920 . . . . .	178

## CHAPTER XI

A SUMMARY OF THE CENTURY . . . . .	184
------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XII

THE CATHOLIC POPULATION IN 1920 . . . . .	197
---	-----

## CHAPTER XIII

THE ANSWER TO THE QUESTION . . . . .	214
--------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XIV

ALLEGED CATHOLIC LOSSES . . . . .	223
I. BISHOP ENGLAND'S STATEMENT . . . . .	224
II. THE LUCERNE MEMORIAL . . . . .	231
III. MISCELLANEOUS ALLEGATIONS . . . . .	240

## CHAPTER XV

CATHOLIC LEAKAGE . . . . .	246
----------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XVI

CHURCH PROBLEMS IN AMERICA . . . . .	257
--------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XVII

CONCLUSION . . . . .	267
----------------------	-----

APPENDIX . . . . .	271
--------------------	-----

INDEX . . . . .	280
-----------------	-----

## STATISTICAL TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I Summary, 1790-1820 . . . . .	73
Ia Comparison of return movement of British and Irish with return movement of Italians, from the United States . . . . .	85
II Immigration from countries over 30 per cent Catholic, by sex, 1869 to 1910 . . . . .	94
III Rate of natural increase in Ireland, 1871-1909 . . . . .	97
IV Immigration and emigration for certain nationalities, compared, 1908-1910 . . . . .	100
V Immigration and emigration for certain nationalities, compared, 1911-1920 . . . . .	100
VI Movement of third-class passengers between United States and European ports, during period 1899-1909, by years . . . . .	101
VII Movement of third-class passengers between United States and European ports, during period 1899-1909 . . . . .	101
VIII Movement of Italians to and from United States, 1887-1920 . . . . .	102
IX Returns of British and Irish (and others) from United States to Great Britain and Ireland, 1870-1920 . . . . .	102
X Aliens debarred at United States ports, 1892-1910 . . . . .	104
XI Length of residence in United States of emigrant aliens departed 1908-1910, for certain nationalities . . . . .	105
XII Catholic percentage in Irish population at end of decades, 1820-1920 . . . . .	108
XIII Population of Ireland, by religion, 1831 to 1911, by decades . . . . .	109
XIV Emigration from Ireland, by province, 1851-1910 . . . . .	110
XV Irish population decrease by province, 1861-1901 . . . . .	111
XVI Catholic percentage in immigration-furnishing countries, 1830-1920 . . . . .	112
XVII Total immigration and net Catholic immigration, 1820-1830 . . . . .	114
XVIII Summary, 1820-1830 . . . . .	117
XIX Total immigration and net Catholic immigration, 1831-1840 . . . . .	123
XX Summary, 1831-1840 . . . . .	125
XXI Total immigration and net Catholic immigration, 1841-1850, and foreign born by nationality, 1850 . . . . .	131

TABLE		PAGE
XXII	Summary, 1841-1850 . . . . .	134
XXIII	Total immigration, net Catholic immigration, and foreign-born increase, 1851-1860, and foreign born, 1860, by nationality . . . . .	140
XXIV	Summary, 1851-1860 . . . . .	145
XXV	Total immigration, net Catholic immigration, and foreign-born increase, 1861-1870, and foreign born, 1870, by nationality . . . . .	149
XXVI	Summary, 1861-1870 . . . . .	153
XXVII	Total immigration, net Catholic immigration, and foreign-born increase, 1871-1880, and foreign born, 1880, by nationality . . . . .	159
XXVIII	Summary, 1871-1880 . . . . .	161
XXIX	Total immigration, net Catholic immigration, and foreign-born increase, 1881-1890, and foreign born, 1890, by nationality . . . . .	165
XXX	Summary, 1881-1890 . . . . .	166
XXXI	Total immigration and emigration, net Catholic immigration, and foreign-born increase, 1891-1900, and foreign born, 1900, by nationality . . . . .	169
XXXII	Summary, 1891-1900 . . . . .	172
XXXIII	Total immigration and emigration, net Catholic immigration, and foreign-born increase, 1901-1910, and foreign born, 1910, by nationality . . . . .	175
XXXIV	Summary, 1901-1910 . . . . .	178
XXXV	Total immigration and emigration, net Catholic immigration, and foreign-born increase, 1911-1920, and foreign born, 1920, by nationality . . . . .	180
XXXVI	Summary, 1911-1920 . . . . .	182
XXXVII	International birth-, and natural-increase-rates per 1,000 of the population in 1909 . . . . .	186
XXXVIII	U. S. birth-registration area birth-, death-, and natural-increase-rates, per 1,000 of the population in 1919 . . . . .	188
XXXIX	Catholic Growth, 1820 to 1920 . . . . .	189
XL	Catholic Growth, 1820-1920: two studies . . . . .	190
XLI	Annual international birth-, death-, and natural-increase-rates per 1,000 of the population for period 1865-1883 (inc.) . . . . .	192
XLIA	Per cent estimated population increase, eliminating immigration and emigration, 1820-1920 . . . . .	193
XLII	Immigration and increase of foreign-born population compared, by decades: 1850-1920 . . . . .	195
XLIII	Per cent increase or decrease of Catholic population of the United States, by geographical divisions and states, according to United States statistics, 1906 to 1916 . . . . .	206

TABLE		PAGE
XLIV	United States statistics on Catholic population and directory statistics on churches, in certain states for 1906 and 1916 . . . . .	207
XLV	United States statistics on Catholic population, and directory statistics on parishes, 1906 and 1916, in certain cities of over 100,000 population in 1910 . . . . .	209
XLVI	United States statistics on Catholic population, and directory statistics on parishes, 1906 and 1916, in certain cities having 50,000 to 100,000 population in 1910 . . . . .	209
XLVII	United States statistics on Catholic population, and directory statistics on parishes, 1906 and 1916, in certain cities having 25,000 to 50,000 population in 1910 . . . . .	210
XLVIII	Estimates of Catholic population of United States for recent years, compared . . . . .	211
XLIX	Catholic churches, and membership, using a foreign language alone or with English, in 1916 . . . . .	218
L	Catholic churches, and membership, using more than one foreign language, exclusively, or with English, in 1916 . . . . .	219
LI	Protestant churches, and membership, using Italian exclusively or with English, 1916 . . . . .	221
LII	Statistical analysis of Bishop England's estimates . . . . .	231
LIII	Growth of Irish stock in United States, 1790 to 1890 . . . . .	236
LIV	Growth of original Irish stock of 1790, natural increase only, 1790-1890 . . . . .	237
LV	Growth of Irish stock, natural and immigrational, 1790-1890 . . . . .	238
LVI	Growth of German stock, natural and immigrational, 1790-1890 . . . . .	238
LVII	Immigration statistics for Austro-Hungarians, Belgians, French, and Italians, 1820 to 1890 . . . . .	239
LVIII	The Abbé Villeneuve's statements compared with statistics . . . . .	240
LIX	Immigration to the United States by country of origin, by religion, 1820 to 1920 . . . . .	244
LX	Original, convert and immigrational Catholic stock, at end of decades, 1820-1920 . . . . .	251
LXI	Per cent distribution of native and foreign-born population of United States, by class of place of residence, 1900 . . . . .	252
LXII	Number and per cent of foreign born in the population of southern states, 1850 to 1920 . . . . .	254
LXIII	Proportion of priests to people and territory in the United States, 1790 to 1920 . . . . .	262
LXIV	Per cent of illiteracy among the populations of specified European countries and of the United States . . . . .	264

TABLE		PAGE
LXV	Yearly and monthly quotas under restriction act of 1921	272
LXVI	Yearly quotas under restriction act of 1924 . . . . .	272
LXVII	Immigration, 1820-1920, by nationalities and decades . .	274-5
LXVIII	White population enumerated at the census of 1790 and surviving at each census year: 1790-1900 . . . . .	276
LXIX	German emigration to the United States by German states, according to per cent Catholic, by decades, 1880 to 1910 . . . . .	276
LXX	Population of areas added to the United States, 1800-1890, at the first enumeration of their inhabitants . .	277
LXXI	Development of the American hierarchy by decades . .	277
LXXII	Conversions in the United States by dioceses, 1918-1920 .	278

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography is not presented as an exhaustive list. It includes all works or articles to which special reference has been made or which have been especially serviceable in the preparation of this work.

✗ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (official organ of the Holy See, Rome). Especially vols. I and IV.

ADAMS, HANNAH—*A View of All Religions* (Boston, 1801).

✗ *American Catholic Historical Researches, The*. “The Missions of the United States in 1838” (translation of extracts from *Annales de la Prop. de la Foi*), Vol. VIII, Oct., 1891. Also various articles *passim*, especially Vol. IV, Jan., 1888, VIII, Oct., 1891, XXII, Jan., 1905, and July, 1905.

*American Catholic Historical Society, Records of, passim.*

ANDRÉ, M. A.—*Le Catholicisme aux États-Unis* (Paris, 1905).

*Annales de l'association de la Propagation de la Foi, 1827-1889.* Especially vols. II, 1828; XI, 1838-39; XLIII, 1871; XLIV, 1872; LIV, 1882; LV, 1883.

ANSON, O.S.B., R.F.—“Catholic Seamen in the Mercantile Marine,” *America*, vol. XXIV, Jan. 1, 1921.

d'AVENEL, GEORGES—“L'Église Française après quinze ans de séparation” *Revue des Deux Mondes*, XCI, Aug. 15, and Sept. 1, 1921.

AVERY, ELIZABETH H.—*The Influence of French Immigration on the Political History of the United States* (Redfield, So. Dak., 1893).

BAGHDASARIAN, S.—*L'Emigration européenne au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle.* 1910.

BAILEY, WM. B.—*Statistics: Modern Social Conditions* (New York, 1906).

BAIRD, ROBERT—*Religion in America* (New York, 1845).

BAKER, G. W.—“The Trend of Adult Mortality in the United States,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. XVIII, Sept. 1923.

✗ BANCROFT, GEO.—*History of the United States of America*, 6 vols., (New York, 1882). *Idem, History of the Formation of the Constitution of the United States of America* (New York, 1885).

BARNARD, GEO.—“Is a Shortage of Clergy Imminent?” *American Ecclesiastical Review*, vol. LXVI, Jan., 1922.

✗ BAYLEY, J. R.—*A Brief Sketch of the Early History of the Catholic Church on the Island of New York* (New York, 1870).

✗ BATTANDIER, MGR. ALBERT—*Annuaire Pontifical Catholique*. Especially 1901, 1902, 1903, 1919.

BERNARD, S.J. PAUL—*La persecution religieuse en Allemagne, 1872-1879, Le clergé et les catholiques* (Paris, 1903). (In pamphlets: *Science et Religion, études pour le temps présent*).

## 18 HAS THE IMMIGRANT KEPT THE FAITH?

BODIO, LUIGI—*Statistica della Emigrazione Italiana all' estero nell' 1881* (Rome, 1882).

BRANN, D.D., HENRY A.—“Mr. Cahensly and the Church in the United States,” *The Catholic World*, vol. LIV, Jan., 1892.

BROMWELL, EM. J.—*History of Immigration to the United States* (New York, 1856).

✗ BURNS, C.S.C., JAS. A.—*Growth and Development of the Catholic School System in the United States* (New York, 1912).

BYRNE, STEPHEN—*Irish Emigration to the United States* (New York, 1873).

CANEVIN, RT. REV. (now Most REV.) REGIS—“Catholic Population in the United States, 1790-1910” *Truth*, vol. XVI, 1912.

*Idem*—“Loss and Gain in the Catholic Church in the United States” (1800-1916), *Catholic Historical Review*, vol. II, 1916-17.

*Idem*—*Catholic Growth in the United States*. (Pittsburgh, 1923)

✗ Cambridge Modern History (New York, 1909, seq.)

CAPEK, THOS.—*The Cechs (Bohemians) in America* (New York, 1920).

CARROLL, H. K.—*The Religious Forces in the United States* (New York, 1893).

CARROLL, FR. (ARCHBISHOP) JOHN—*Relation of the State of Religion in the United States, 1785*.

✗ Catholic Builders of the Nation, vol. II, art. “The Contribution of the Italian Catholic Clergy to the United States,” by Rev. Aurelio Palmieri, O.S.A., S.T.D.; C. E. McGuire, K.S.G., Ph.D., Editor, 5 vols. (Boston, 1923).

*Catholic Directory*:

- ✓ Metropolitan to 1861.
- ✓ Batterby's, 1845-1857.
- ✓ Sadlier's, 1864-1891.
- ✓ Hoffman's, 1890-1901.
- ✓ Kenedy's (“Official”), 1900—

✓ Catholic Encyclopedia, *The* (New York, 1907, seq.)

✓ Catholic History of Alabama and the Floridas, *A*, by a Member of the Order of Mercy (New York, 1908).

“Catholic Immigration Association of Canada,” *America*, vol. XXIV, Dec. 18, 1920.

“Catholicity in France,” ANON.—*Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, vol. XXV, Dec., 1924.

“Catholic Leakage and Its Cause,” by “A Catholic Missionary,” the *Fortnightly Review*, vol. XX, 1913.

“Catholic Leakage—Means to check it,” *Ibid.*

“Catholic Leakage—Our Leakage,” *Ibid.*

“Catholics and Immigration,” the *Catholic World*, vol. CXVI, Jan. 1923, p. 549.

“Catholic Population and the Catholic Directory, The,” by X. Y. Z., the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, vol. LIV, Mar. 1916, p. 320.

CHANDEZE, GUSTAVE—*De l'intervention des pouvoirs publics dans l'emigration et l'immigration au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1898).

✗ CHANNING, EDW.—*History of the United States*, vol. V, Period of Transition (New York, 1921).

CHICKERING, JESSE—*Immigration into the United States* (Boston, 1848).

“Church in America, The,” *American Catholic Historical Papers*, vol. IX, March, 1898.

COAKLEY, THOS. F.—“Is Peter’s Bark Leaking?” *America*, vol. XI, May 16, 1914, p. 102.

*Idem*, “Is Peter’s Bark Leaking?” *America*, vol. XXIX, May 19, 1923, p. 108.

COBB, IRVIN P.—“The Lost Tribes of the Irish in the South.” Lecture before American-Irish Historical Society, New York, Jan. 6, 1917.

COBB, SANFORD H.—*The Rise of Religious Liberty in America* (New York, 1902).

*Idem*, *The Story of the Palatines* (New York, 1897).

*Codex Juris Canonici* (Rome, 1917).

COMMONS, JOHN R.—*Races and Immigrants in America*, 1907.

CONRY, J. P.—*Social Organization of Italian Catholics, the Catholic World*, vol. CXIV, Oct., 1921.

CRUZIL, L’ABBÉ LUCIEN—*Le catholicisme dans les pays Scandinaves* (Danemark, Islande, Norvège, et Suède) (Paris, 1902).

CURTIS, GEO. TICKNOR—*Hist. of Constitution of U. S.* 2 vols. (New York, 1854).

“The Cyrenians,” *Catholic Charities Review*, vol. VI, Oct., 1922, and vol. VII, Feb., 1923.

DAY, VICTOR—“Correspondence Course in Christian Doctrine,” *American Ecclesiastical Review*, vol. LXVII, Oct., 1922.

DE COURCY, HENRY, and SHEA, JOHN GILMARY—*History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1879).

DE BOW, J.—*Compendium of United States Census, 1850* (Washington, 1854).

DILHET, JEAN—*État de l’Église*, translated and annotated by P. W. Browne (Washington, 1921).

DOUGLAS, JAMES—*New England and New France* (New York, 1913).

DOWLING, MOST REV. AUSTIN—“Address to Holy Name Society, Chicago,” *the Catholic Mind*, vol. XIX, Feb. 8, 1921.

DUBLIN, L. I.—Paper read at Second International Congress of Eugenics, held in New York, Sept., 1921.

*Idem*, “The Significance of the Declining Birth Rate.” *Congressional Record*, vol. LVI, Jan. 11, 1918, p. 888.

*Idem* and BAKER, G. W.—“The Mortality of Race Stocks in Pennsylvania and New York.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. XVII, March, 1920.

DUBOIS, L. PAUL—*Contemporary Ireland* (Dublin and New York, 1908).

DUVAL, JULES—*Histoire de l’émigration européenne, asiatique, et africaine au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1862).

*l’Église catholique au Canada.* ANON.—(Quebec, 1909).

EMMETT, THOS. A.—*Irish Emigration During the 17th and 18th Centuries* (New York, 1899).

ENGLAND, BISHOP JOHN—*Works of*, 5 vols. (Baltimore, 1849).

FAIRCHILD, HENRY P.—*Immigration, a World Movement and Its American Significance* (New York, 1913).

FAUST, A. B.—*The German Element in the United States*, 2 vols., (New York, 1909).

FERRATA, H. E. CARDINAL—“The Church in the Present Century.” *American Ecclesiastical Review*, vol. XXI, 1899.

FINOTTI, Jos. M.—*Bibliographia Catholica Americana* (New York, 1872).

FISH, C. R.—“Documents Relative to the Adjustment of the R. C. Organization in the U. S. to the Conditions of National Independence (1783-1789).” *American Historical Review*, vol. XV, July, 1910.

FISHER, S. G.—“Has Immigration Increased Our Population?” *Popular Science Monthly*, vol. XLVIII, 1895.

FISKE, JOHN—*The Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America* (New York, 1903).

FLOM, G. T.—*Norwegian Immigration to the United States from the Earliest Beginning Down to the Year 1848* (Cedar Rapids, 1909).

FOERSTER, ROBERT F.—*The Italian Emigration of Our Times* (Cambridge, Mass., 1919).

FORD, HENRY JONES—*The Scotch-Irish in America* (Princeton, 1915).

FOSDICK, L. J.—*The French Blood in America* (New York, 1906).

GANNON, S. J., P. J.—“Religious Statistics in Ireland.” *The Catholic Mind*, vol. XIX, 1921. Also *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, vol. XVII, Jan., 1921.

GARDINER, O. C.—“Foreign Immigration: Its Natural and Extraordinary Causes.” *American Review*, vol. VI, 1847, and vol. VII, 1848.

“Geographic Influences in American History.” *American Catholic Quarterly*, vol. XXIX, July, 1904.

“German Immigration.” *Mercersburg Review*, vol. II, 1850.

✓ GIBBONS, JAMES CARDINAL—*A Retrospect of Fifty Years* (Baltimore, 1916).

GRACE, Wm. R.—“The Irish in America.” *Lecture*, Boston, Feb., 1886. *Great Britain, Board of Trade, Emigration and Immigration, statistical papers and tables, Parliament papers*, various years.

GREER, B. C.—*Early Immigrants to Virginia, 1623-1666* (Richmond, 1912).

GUILDAY, PETER—“The Church in the United States (1870-1920),” *American Catholic Historical Review*, vol. VI, 1921.

*Idem, Life and Times of John Carroll* (New York, 1923).

*Idem, National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy* (Washington, 1924).

*Idem, The Catholic Church in Virginia, 1815-1822* (New York, 1924).

GWYNN, DENIS—“Is France Catholic?” *The Catholic World*, vol. CXVII, April, 1923. Cf. also *Blackfriars*, vol. II, Dec., 1921.

*Idem, The Catholic Reaction in France* (New York, 1924).

HALL, PRESCOTT F.—*Immigration and Its Effects upon the United States* (New York, 1906).

HANNA, CHAS. A.—*The Scotch-Irish* (New York, 1902).

HAYES, C. J.—*A Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, 2 vols. (New York, 1916-1924).

HEALY, P. J.—“Recent Activities of Catholic Historians,” *Papers of the American Society of Church History*. Second series, vol. VI. (New York, 1921).

HECKER, I.—*The Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1880).

HILL, Jos. A.—“Some Results of the 1920 Population Census,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. XVIII, Sept., 1922.

HUGHES, M. REV. JOHN—*Complete Works*, 3 vols. (New York, 1865).

HUGHES, THOS.—*History of the Society of Jesus in North America* (New York, 1907).

HUMPHREY, E. F.—*Nationalism and Religion in America: 1774-1789* (Boston, 1924).

“Immigration, History of Its Progress from Colonial Times to the Present.” *New York Bureau of Labor Statistics, Report, 1898* (New York, 1899).

IRELAND, MOST REV. JOHN—“The Church in America, Its Yesterday and Tomorrow.” Sermon in *Souvenir of the Installation of M. Rev. John J. Keane, D.D., as Archbishop of Dubuque*. 1900.

JANNET, CLAUDIO—*Les États-Unis Contemporains*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1889).

*Jewish Activities in the United States*, vol. II of *The International Jew* (Dearborn, Mich., 1921).

JOHNSON, STANLEY C.—*A History of Emigration from the United Kingdom to North America, 1763-1912* (London, 1913).

“Journal of a French Traveler in the Colonies, 1865,” *American Historical Review*, vol. XXVI, 1921.

KAPP, FRIEDRICH—*Immigration and the Commissioners of Emigration of the State of New York* (New York, 1870).

*Idem*, “Immigration,” *Journal of Social Science*, vol. II, pp. 1-30. (New York, 1870).

KELLEY, RT. REV. F. C.—*The Story of Extension* (Chicago, 1922).

KIRLIN, JOS. L. J.—*Catholicity in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1909).

KROSE, S.J., H. A.—*Kirchliches Handbuch, 1908-1909* (Freiburg, 1909).

“Lay Apostolate in Pittsburgh, The,” *America*, vol. XXVII, Aug. 26, 1922.

LECARPENTIER, G.—*Le catholicisme en Irlande* (Paris, 1904).

*Idem*, *Le catholicisme en Écosse* (Paris, 1905).

LEGOYT, ALFRED—*L'émigration européenne* (Paris, 1861).

LENEUF, H.—*La foi irlandaise en Amérique* (Citeaux, 1880).

LEO XIII, POPE—*The Great Encyclical Letters of* (New York, 1903).

LIEGEARD, A.—“Immigration into the United States.” *Royal Statistical Society, Journal*, vol. XLVII, 1884.

LINGARD and BELLOC—*History of England*, 11 vols. (New York, 1912).

LOCKINGTON, S.J., W. J.—*The Soul of Ireland* (New York, 1920).

LOEPPERT, ADAM J.—*Modernism and the Vatican* (New York, 1912).

22 HAS THE IMMIGRANT KEPT THE FAITH?

LORD, E., TREVOR, J. J. D., and BARROWS, SAM J.—*The Italian in America* (New York, 1905).

McGEE, THOS. D'ARCY—*A History of the Irish Settlers in North America* (Boston, 1855).

McLANAHAN, SAMUEL—*Our People of Foreign Speech* (New York, 1904).

MACMASTER, JOHN B.—*History of the People of the United States*, 6 vols. (New York, 1883).

McSWEENEY, E. F. X.—“American Catholics and the Propagation of the Faith,” *American Ecclesiastical Review*, vol. XX, 1899.

MAGUIRE, JOHN F.—*The Irish in America* (New York, 1868).

MANNIX, E. J.—*American Convert Movement* (New York, 1923).

MARSHALL, A. F.—“Is the Church Gaining or Losing Ground in Catholic Countries?” *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, vol. XI, Oct., 1886.

“Mauvais Plaidoyer, Un.” *Catholic Historical Review*, N. S. I., Jan., 1922, p. 560.

*Memorial Volume of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1885).

MICHELETTI, A. M.—*Jus Pianum* (Rome, 1914).

MONAGHAN, J. C.—“Immigration Problems,” *Catholic World*, vol. LXXIX, 1904.

MOSELEY, DAISY H.—“The Catholic Social Worker in an Italian District,” *Catholic World*, vol. CXIV, Feb., 1922.

MULHALL, MICHAEL G.—*The Dictionary of Statistics* (London, 1892).

MURPHY, T. J.—“Were the Acadians Rebels?” *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, vol. XII, April, 1887.

MURRAY, JOHN O'KANE—*A Popular History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1882).

MYERS, GUSTAVUS—“Is the Church on a Decline?” *Current History*, vol. XIV, Sept., 1921.

“Nationalism and the Missions,” *Catholic Mind*, vol. XVIII, Oct. 8, 1920.

NEILL, CHAS. P.—“A Catholic Census for 1900,” *Catholic University Bulletin*, vol. VI, 1900.

DE NEVERS, EDMOND—*L'Âme américaine*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1900).

*Idem*—“Les États-Unis ne sont pas un pays Anglo-Saxon,” *Revue Canadienne*, 39<sup>e</sup> année, 1903.

NICHOLS, ROBERT HASTINGS—*The Growth of the Christian Church*, vol. XI of *Modern Christianity* (Philadelphia, 1914).

NITTI, F. S.—*The Wealth of Italy*. Translated by E. C. Longobardi, (Rome, 1907).

O'BRIEN, GEO.—*The Economic History of Ireland from the Union to the Famine* (New York, 1921).

O'BRIEN, MICHAEL J.—*A Hidden Phase of American History* (New York, 1919).

*Idem*—“Immigration, etc. Records of the Irish in America in Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century,” *Journal of American-Irish Historical Society*, vol. XIV, 1914-15.

*Idem*—"America's Debt to Ireland," *Catholic Mind*, vol. XVII, 1919.

*Idem*—"Early Irish Schoolmasters in New England," *Catholic Historical Review*, vol. III, 1917-18.

*Idem*—"Irish Immigrants from English Ports in the Eighteenth Century," *Journal of the American-Irish Historical Society*, vol. XVIII, 1919.

O'CONNELL, J. D.—*The Scotch-Irish Delusion in America* (Washington, 1897).

O'CONNELL, J. J.—*Catholicity in the Carolinas and Georgia* (New York, 1879).

O'CONNOR, R. F.—"A Patriarchal Priest of Today" (Reference to famine victims in Canada.) *American Ecclesiastical Review*, vol. LXVI, Feb., 1922, p. 119.

OGBURN, WM. F.—"Factors Affecting the Marital Condition of the Population." *Publications of the American Sociological Society*, vol. XVIII, 1923.

→ O'GORMAN, THOS.—*A History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1902).

O'HANLON, VERY REV. J. CANON—*Irish-American History of the United States* (Dublin, 1903).

O'HARA, E. V.—"Growth of the Catholic Church in the United States, 1906-1916." *America*, vol. XXVI, March 18, 1922.

*Idem*—"Slow Increase of the Catholic Population," *America*, vol. XXVI, March 25, 1922. This article was utilized by *The Literary Digest*, May 20, 1922: "Why Catholic Growth Hesitates."

*Idem*—"The Lane County, Oregon, Experiment in the Catholic Rural Program," *N. C. W. C. Bulletin*, vol. II, Dec., 1920.

O'HART, JOHN—*Irish Pedigrees* (Dublin, 1892).

O'MALLEY, M. D., AUSTIN—"Irish Vital Statistics in America," *Studies*, vol. VII, 1918.

O'REILLY, E. J.—"The National Council of Catholic Men," *America*, vol. XXVI, Nov. 5, 1921.

ORTH, SAMUEL P.—*Our Foreigners* (New Haven, 1920).

O'SULLIVAN, D. A.—"Religious Freedom in United States Treaties and Public Law," *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, vol. XII, July, 1887.

"Our Catholic Increase," *America*, vol. XI, May 2, 1914, editorial.

"Our Godless Immigrants," *Public Opinion*, vol. XL, 1906.

PALMIERI, O. S. A., F. AURELIO—"Italian Protestantism in the United States," *Catholic World*, vol. CVII, 1918.

*Idem*—Cf. *Catholic Builders of the Nation*.

PASTERIS, DR. EMILIANO—*Religione e Clero in America* (Rome, 1908).

PHELAN, THOS. P.—"Catholic Patriotism in Revolutionary Days," *Catholic Historical Review*, N. S. I., Jan., 1922.

PHILIPPOVITCH, EUGEN VON—"L'émigration européenne," *Revue d'Economie Politique*, vol. IV, 1890.

"Philosophy of Immigration, The," *Catholic World*, vol. IX, 1869.

"Progrès du catholicisme, Les," *Revue Pratique d'Apologetique*, vol. VI, 1908, p. 478.

POWER, T. R.—“A Sad Chapter from the Story of Ireland” (Cromwellian deportations.) *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, vol. XV, Oct., 1890.

PURCELL, RICHARD J.—*Connecticut in Transition, 1775-1818* (Washington, 1918).

“Religious Statistics of the World,” *Catholic Mind*, vol. XXII, No. 5, March 8, 1924.

RICHARD, EDOUARD—*Acadia*, 2 vols. (New York, 1895).

ROBERTS, PETER—*The New Immigration* (New York, 1912).

ROSENGARTEN, J. C.—*French Colonists and Exiles in the United States* (New York, 1907).

ROSS, C.S.P., JOHN ELIOT—“Number of Catholics in United States,” *Baltimore Catholic Review*, July 19, 1924.

ROSSITER, WM. S.—“The Adventure of Population Growth,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. XVIII, March, 1923.

*Idem—Increase of Population in the United States 1910-1920* (Washington, 1922).

RUPP, I. D.—*An Original History of the Religious Denominations at Present Existing in the United States* (Philadelphia, 1844).

RUSSELL, T. W.—*Ireland and the Empire* (New York, 1901).

RUSSELL, W. T. (now Rt. Rev.)—*Maryland, the Land of Sanctuary* (Baltimore, 1907).

SAGUNTINUS, DR. E.—“The New Discrimination Act,” *Columbia*, vol. IV, May, 1925.

“Santa Maria Institute, The,” (Laymen’s Missionary League and Italians in Cincinnati)—*America*, vol. XXVI, Nov. 19, 1921, p. 118.

SCHUYLER, EUGENE—“Italian Immigration into the United States,” *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. IV, 1889.

SHAHAN, RT. REV. THOS. J.—“A Century of Catholicism,” *Catholic University Bulletin*, vol. VI, 1900.

*Idem—“Roman Catholicism in Russia (1796-1825)” American Catholic Quarterly Review*, vol. XXX, 1905.

SHEA, JOHN GILMARY—*The Catholic Church in the United States*, 4 vols. (New York, 1886-90).

*Idem—“No Actual Need of a Catholic Party in the United States.” American Catholic Quarterly Review*, vol. XII, Oct., 1887.

SMITH, RICHARD MAYO—*Emigration and Immigration* (New York, 1890).

*Idem—“Immigration and the Foreign-born Population,” American Statistical Association Publications*, vol. III, 1893.

SPALDING, J. L.—*Life of the Most Rev. M. J. Spalding* (New York, 1873).

*Idem—“The Religious Mission of the Irish People* (New York, 1880).

STANTON, T. J.—*A Century of Growth: History of the Church in Western Maryland*, 2 vols. (Baltimore, 1900).

*Statesman’s Year-Book*, annual, London.

“Statistics,” *United States Catholic Magazine*, vol. II, 1843.

SWEENEY, HELEN M.—“Handling the Immigrant,” *Catholic World*, vol. LXIII, 1896.

TARDIVEL, JULES—*La situation religieuse aux États-Unis* (Paris, 1900).

TAYLOR, HANNIS—*Origin and Growth of the American Constitution* (New York, 1911).

THEBAUD, S. J., A. J.—*Three-Quarters of a Century, (1807-1882)* (New York, 1904).

TONNELAT, E.—*L'Allemagne hors d'Europe* (Paris, 1900).

TUKE, J. H.—“Irish Emigration,” *Nineteenth Century*, vol. IX, 1881.

United States Government Publications. All at Washington, D. C.:
   
Abstract of the Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910. 1913.
   
Abstract of the Fourteenth Census of the United States, 1920. 1922.
   
Fourteenth Census of the United States, 1920. Vol. II. Population. 1922.
   
Census Office, *Special Reports, Mortality, 1900-4 (1906)*, etc.
   
Century of Population Growth, 1790-1900, A. 1909.
   
Congressional Record, Winter Session, 1892. 1893, etc.
   
DeBow, J. D. B.—*Statistical View of the United States, a Compendium of the Seventh Census, 1850.* 1854.
   
DINGLEY, F. L.—*European Emigration, United States Special Consular Reports*, vol. II. 1890.
   
Europe as an Emigrant-exporting Continent and the United States as an Immigrant-receiving Nation. 1924.
   
Indian Population in the United States and Alaska, 1910. 1915.
   
Negro Population in the United States, 1790-1915. 1918.
   
Religious Bodies, 1906. 2 vols., 1909.
   
Religious Bodies, 1916. 2 vols., 1919.
   
ROSSITER, W. S.—*Increase of Population in the United States 1910-1920.* 1922.
   
Statistical Abstract of the United States. Annual.
   
United States Immigration Commission, *Reports of*,
   
Vol. III, *Statistical Review of Immigration, 1820-1910; Distribution of Immigrants, 1850-1900.* 1911.
   
Vol. IV, *Emigration Conditions in Europe.* 1911.
   
Vol. V, *Dictionary of Races or Peoples.* 1911.
   
VILLENEUVE, ALPHONSE—“Les États-Unis d’Amerique et l’émigration,” *XX<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, tome 2<sup>e</sup>, année 1891; 3<sup>e</sup>, 1892.
   
WALBURG, A. H.—*The Question of Nationality* (Cincinnati, 1889).
   
WALSH, M. D., JAS. J.—“Irish Mortality in New York and Pennsylvania,” *Studies*, vol. X, 1921.
   
WALWORTH, CLARENCE—*The Oxford Movement in America* (New York, 1895).
   
WEARE, EUGENE—“Our Immigration Problem,” *America*, vol. XXIX, May 5, 1923.
   
WEBER, N. A.—*A General History of the Christian Era*, 2 vols. (Washington, 1919, 1922).
   
WICKHAM, JOHN E.—“A Missionary Band of Diocesan Priests,” *American Ecclesiastical Review*, vol. LXVI, Jan., 1922.
   
WIERNICK, PETER—*History of the Jews in America* (New York, 1912).
   
WILLS, ALLEN S.—*Life of Cardinal Gibbons* (Baltimore, 1911).
   
YOUNG, ARTHUR—*A Tour in Ireland* (Dublin, 1780; London, 1892, 1912).

## ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations are used in citing the respective works indicated; all are issued by the United States Government, at the Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

A.F.C.—*Abstract of the Fourteenth Census of the United States, 1920.* 1922.

A.T.C.—*Abstract of the Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910.* 1913.

C.P.G.—*A Century of Population Growth, 1790-1900.* 1909.

E.C.E.—*Emigration Conditions in Europe.* Vol. IV of the Reports of the United States Immigration Commission. 1911.

S.A.U.S.—*Statistical Abstract of the United States.* Annual. Where no date is given the citation is from the issue for 1920.

S.R.I.—*Statistical Review of Immigration, 1820-1910; Distribution of Immigrants, 1850-1900.* Vol. III of the Reports of the United States Immigration Commission. 1911.

HAS THE IMMIGRANT  
KEPT THE FAITH?



# HAS THE IMMIGRANT KEPT THE FAITH

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTORY

A consideration of the growth of the Catholic Church in the United States since the establishment of American independence and the appointment of the first member of the American hierarchy in the person of Bishop John Carroll, presents to the student a problem which, though touched upon by many writers and discussed by not a few controversialists, yet awaits a careful, scientific and unbiased treatment. The problem is the relation of immigration to the growth of the Church. In the year 1785 the United States contained, according to the estimate of Bishop Carroll (then prefect apostolic) about 23,000 white Catholics,<sup>1</sup> or considerably less than one per cent of the total population, ministered to by 34 priests; in 1920 the number of priests, 21,643, almost equalled the number of faithful in the former year, while the Catholic population was estimated at 20,000,000, or about twenty per cent of the total population and nearly fifty per cent of the church-going population. The number of churches, colleges, schools, hospitals and charitable organizations presents also a proportionate increase during the period, so that the growth of the Church in America is generally described as extraordinary. Extraordinary it has truly been when we consider that the Church in the new-born Republic, then a despised, negligible factor in the life of the nation, now ranks first among all denominations in number of actual adherents, practically equalling the combined membership of the next four denominations (Baptists, Methodists, Lutherans, and Presbyterians), while it stands out in the life of the nation a power for morality and service which all are compelled to acknowledge. Extraordinary, too, has been this growth when compared with the increase shown by the Church in the various countries of Europe in the same period. In the territory which later became the German Empire, for example, the Catholics

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. G. Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the U. S.*, vol. II, p. 257.

numbered in 1800 about six million or approximately thirty per cent of the total population; in 1910<sup>2</sup> there were some twenty-two million Catholics in a population of sixty-five million souls—about thirty-five per cent—and after making due allowance for the preponderance of Catholics in Alsace-Lorraine, which had been acquired during the period, an acquisition offset by the previous loss of Austria, it is seen that the proportion had increased appreciably, but not abnormally during the century. In Austria-Hungary, during the same period, the proportion of Catholics remained fairly constant, about sixty-seven per cent in the entire empire, about seventy-nine per cent in Austria and fifty-one per cent in Hungary. In England the Catholics formed three per cent in 1800, while today they number approximately five per cent of the population. In Ireland may be noted the only case of an appreciable decrease in the proportion of Catholics (from eighty-two to seventy-four per cent) an anomaly to be explained by a Protestant immigration and possibly to a slight extent by the departure of Catholics in greater proportionate number than Protestants. Again, the famine of the forties wrought greater havoc among the poverty-stricken Catholics leaving its stamp not only through the deaths caused immediately, but also through the decreased birth rate and the increased mortality among the impoverished and weakened survivors.

However, such comparisons are unfair unless one takes into account that most important factor in the life of the American Church which not only was not present in the European examples just cited, but which conversely, acted as a drag on the mother Churches of the Old World; the tide of immigration which brought millions to America meant the loss of millions to Europe. Immigration has been for the American Republic one of its chief sources of growth. From the early days of the Republic, when Europe, torn and bleeding from the many wounds received in the revolutions, in the Napoleonic wars, and in the revolts of the nineteenth century, seemed to offer no longer to the peasant and the laborer an opportunity to acquire for himself and his family the means to live in peace and contentment, the Celt and the Teuton, the Norseman and the Latin and the Slav, in unceasingly growing numbers sought out the "land of promise" beyond the Atlantic, whither they brought their gifts of brawn and muscle, of simple and honest life, a never failing cure for the dry rot and canker which were sapping in places the very lifeblood of some of the older stock of the country. But what of their heritage of faith? Many among these immigrants, but by no means so many untold millions nor in such overwhelming majority as so many careless writers allege, were Catholics.

<sup>2</sup> The fall of the German Empire makes reference to 1920 impracticable.

Accordingly there comes naturally to our minds the question: What actually has been the effect of this immigration on the Catholic Church in the United States? Has the numerical growth of the latter been commensurate not only with the two ordinary factors of natural increase and conversion but also with the extraordinary factor, immigration, which plays such a prominent part in American growth in general? Have the Catholic immigrants to the New World been retained and assimilated by the American Church or have they, on the contrary, shown a prevailing or at least a general tendency to desert the faith of their fathers amidst their new surroundings in the land of liberty? Such queries naturally present themselves to our consideration because of the numerous statements that seek to establish an affirmative answer to the last question. Almost before the flow of immigration into this country had become appreciable, the assertion was made that the Catholic immigrants were not retaining their faith after their arrival in America. With reliance upon such claims, it has been repeatedly charged that the apparently enormous growth of the Church in the United States really covers a lamentable loss to the faith; it has been asserted and reiterated that immigrants by the millions slough off their old faith as a preliminary to the proper orientation of their aims and hopes and aspirations in the New World; "it has been confidently stated that the moment the Irish [for example] touch the free soil of America they lose the old faith . . . that there is something in the very nature of republican institutions fatal to the Church of Rome",<sup>3</sup> and "that the second generation of Irish here give up the Church."<sup>4</sup> In a word it is claimed that the atmosphere of America is laden with a deadly miasma which has stifled the growth of the Church and wrought spiritual ruin in the souls of millions who, had they remained in Europe, had remained also Catholic.

One would suppose that such a serious arraignment of the American Church, of the Catholics in America, or perhaps, to speak more precisely, of the quondam Catholics who (according to supposition) find it so easy to change their faith with their change of habitation, would be supported by statistics of such an incontrovertible nature that the conclusion must needs be admitted. Such, however, is decidedly not the case, surprising to state, for one may search diligently through the long series of articles and pamphlets that have appeared on the subject, for arguments substantiating the assertions, and the search will be in vain. Almost invariably the subject is approached with an *a priori* judgment on the point at issue; statistics, or figures which pass for such, are quoted freely from a deceptive memory; conjecture replaces fact;

<sup>3</sup> John F. Maguire, *Irish in America*, p. 346.

<sup>4</sup> Edmond de Nevers, *L'Ame Américaine*, vol. II, p. 87.

supposition stands forth where a logical if not indeed a mathematical conclusion should be demanded; sometimes even racial and national prejudice is allowed free rein, and an indictment of the most serious possible consequences is drawn up, which, because it is indeed plausible, is accepted, and, in fact, widely accepted today, as mirroring truthfully the conditions which have prevailed in the American Church during the past century. To one who accepts this indictment at its face value as a true and proved conviction, it must come as a shock to learn that there is extant no scientific treatment of the question in which the facts have been duly and thoroughly sifted so as to give warrant to the assertions made; and it is equally surprising to note that no sufficient, lengthy and statistical study has yet appeared which can claim to have definitely answered the assertions by contrary proof.

Yet there is one fact, undeniable and concrete, which obtrudes itself upon our notice: the American Church has, in the past century, increased by millions. All commentators are here in agreement that the abnormal development has been due to immigration, oblivious of the fact that they are consequently in presence of the anomalous dilemma: if the immigrants have generally lapsed from the faith, then there could not have occurred such an accretion of millions to the Church through immigration, and conversely, if there has been an accretion of millions through immigration, then the immigrants have not lapsed, at least by the wholesale.

The present study is an attempt to solve the problem indicated in the foregoing paragraphs. To one who gives even the briefest attention to the question it will readily become evident that the weak point in all discussions is the treatment accorded the statistics of immigration into the United States. It is, however, chiefly in such records that the solution is to be sought. Moreover, as an essential part of such statistics the record of *emigration* from this country, so far as it can be determined, is a factor which demands careful consideration. Too many writers have blindly proceeded on the theory that no immigrant ever emigrates, whereas, as will be brought out in the course of this work, emigration has at times risen as high as seventy-five, eighty-two, and eighty-four per cent of the immigration in certain periods. Paying particular attention, therefore, to immigration, balanced by the outgoing emigration, the present study proposes to compute, decade by decade, the growth of the Catholic population in the United States, through natural increase, conversion, net immigration and territorial accession.

It must be posited as a preliminary principle that the natural increase among Catholics has been practically the same as that of the whole population. Although without doubt some of the older, and generally Protestant, stock in certain sections of the

country has fallen appreciably behind the newer peoples in its rate of natural increase, the general rate of increase among the newer stocks has been, at least until very recently, approximately the same, irrespective of religious complexion. Since the older stocks represent a comparatively negligible quantity, and since the non-Catholics have always been in the majority among the immigrants, it would be not only unfair, but quite unscientific to conclude that a higher increase than the general rate should be applied to the Catholic population in computing its growth.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, it has been quite conclusively proved that in the case of at least one predominantly Catholic race, the Irish, the high mortality rate so far offsets any possibly higher birth rate, that it is certain that their net natural increase does not equal the general rate for the country. The death rate for Italians and Germans is also excessive.<sup>6</sup>

Since official American immigration statistics do not go back beyond 1820, that year has been taken as the starting point for this study. Three points to be determined arise: the number of Catholics in the United States in 1820, the increase (properly apportioned among the various causative factors) during the period to be considered, and finally the number of Catholics in the United States in 1920. Were it possible to compute with mathematical accuracy these three points one could bring forward a certain solution of the problem, for with the aid of the statistics on the first two points, one could determine exactly what should have been the Catholic population of this country in 1920, and a comparison of that figure with the answer to the third point—the actual Catholic population in 1920—would solve the question at issue.

Unfortunately the three points in question are not so easily determined. It is lamentable that there has never been any accurate census of Catholics in the United States at any given time. The Church itself has never made any attempt to enumerate its followers other than by estimates of pastors and bishops; and the Government, unlike that of many European countries, does not include in its census returns, a classification of the inhabitants according to religious affiliation.<sup>7</sup> Accordingly, in determining the actual Catholic population in 1820 and 1920, respectively, recourse must be had to estimates, and it is upon a study and evaluation

<sup>5</sup> For general statistics on the religious affiliation of immigrants during the century, see Table LIX. For the birth rate among foreign peoples, compare Tables III, XXXVII and XLI. For United States statistics, cf. Table XXXVIII. Cf. also Table XLIIa.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. pp. 97 and 129 and Tables III, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XLI.

<sup>7</sup> In 1890, 1906 and 1916 the Government compiled rather valuable data on the religious organization and affiliation of its population, but based merely on the estimates of pastors and not on a census. Cf. *Religious Bodies, 1916*, Part I, p. 12.

of these estimates that, in great measure, will rest the value of the conclusions to be presented.

Yet it would be wrong to conclude immediately that a study based on estimates will for that reason be worthless. It will in truth have the same value as—no more, yet no less than—that which the estimates bear. Now, it will be apparent in the course of this work that the various, generally decadal, estimates of the Catholic population represent the fairly unanimous agreement of authorities who were in a position to speak with some degree of accuracy. When, at times, exception is taken to some estimates, it will be only for sufficient and stated reasons. If, then, we can trust the intermediate decadal estimates it follows naturally that, with the exception noted, we can trust the two terminal estimates of 1820 and of 1920. This being the case, any valid conclusion drawn from these premises will be trustworthy and by no means lightly to be rejected.

To indicate further the procedure to be followed, it is necessary to speak of the method to be used in computing the Catholic growth itself. Government statistics enable us to follow, decade by decade through the century the growth of the population as a whole; and, while those statistics do not always segregate the different factors, it is possible to determine the force of those that concern us by utilizing the statistics available in regard to immigration into, and the foreign born in, the United States. As indicated in a previous paragraph, it is in this manner and by these means that it is proposed to trace the Catholic growth of the century by computing for each decade the net Catholic immigration from each country according to the Catholic percentage of population among its inhabitants. It will be apparent that the figures obtained for the end of each decade will represent what the Catholic population should have been at the time. Finally, a comparison of the results obtained for 1920, with the estimates of the actual Catholic population in that year, will be the basis for the final conclusions. If the two figures are in substantial agreement, the conclusion is inevitable that the growth has been satisfactory; whereas if the growth has really been decidedly unsatisfactory, if there has been a continuous and lamentable loss through the apostasy of immigrants, the fact must come to light through the discrepancy that will consequently be apparent between the two final figures. Furthermore, as a complement of the statistics which will be here adduced, an evaluation of the various statements charging an enormous loss in Catholic membership owing to apostasy among immigrants will be attempted in the light of the final conclusion.

In the present study, as only the white race is to be considered, the general population statistics and the Catholic population estimates will have reference only to that race, omitting Asiatics,

Negroes and Indians. Since the problem to be treated is essentially an immigrational one, and since there have been practically no Negro or Indian immigrants, evidently to include them in the computation would unnecessarily complicate matters.

## CHAPTER II

### CATHOLICITY IN THE COLONIES TO 1790

As a preliminary to determining the number of Catholics and the state of the Church in 1820 it will be necessary to glance briefly over the history of Catholicity, especially from the numerical standpoint, during the colonial period, and during the years following the establishment of the American Government.

The North American colonies which later wrested their independence from Great Britain were founded chiefly on the general principle of religious freedom but not of religious toleration. Hence there was in these colonies hardly a trace of organized Catholicity until well along in the eighteenth century. Maryland, it is true, was founded by Catholics as a haven of toleration; but when control passed out of the hands of Catholics, repression and persecution of the latter had its inception.

However, although the Church, as such, was slow in getting a foothold in the colonies, individual Catholics made their way thither from the beginning. The majority of these few Catholics who were to be found scattered throughout the colonies in the early days were the remnants of the Irish who had been transported from their native land after Cromwell had completed its subjugation about 1651. Children torn from their parental homes, girls and boys ruthlessly seized in the towns and cities, indentured servants—it was of these and the few voluntary emigrants that the Catholic membership was chiefly composed in most of the colonies. As a consequence the condition of the Church in the greater part of the American colonies was similar to, if not worse than, its status in England for its weak members were unable to cope successfully with the persecution and intolerance which was their lot.

However, despite the adverse conditions, at the time of the establishment of the Catholic hierarchy in the United States by the appointment of John Carroll as bishop of Baltimore in 1789, the 23,000 Catholics of 1785 had increased to approximately 27,000 as estimated by Bishop Carroll himself.<sup>1</sup> Including the colored,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. O'K. Murray, *A Popular History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, p. 200. Bishop Carroll's estimate was 30,000, but it included over 3,000 colored Catholics. Cf. also George Bancroft, *History of the Formation of the Constitution of the United States of America*, p. 164.

there were supposed to be about 16,000 in Maryland (15,800 in 1785, of whom 3,000 were Negro slaves), somewhat over 7,000 in Pennsylvania, 3,000 around Detroit, and about 4,000 scattered throughout the rest of the country. The distribution itself is most significant; Maryland it will be remembered, was founded by Catholics as the land of sanctuary, and despite the Puritan attacks, despite the unfortunate apostasies among its leaders and the consequent persecution, this colony had always remained a refuge for members of the faith; Pennsylvania, too, founded by the persecuted Quakers, had early opened its doors to the down-trodden and oppressed Catholics; Detroit and vicinity, settled originally by the French, still preserved that national complexion, and because of its proximity to Canada the faith there was lively and in a sense flourishing. In these three centers were gathered nearly ninety per cent of the Catholics of the nation; the vast expanse composed of New England, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Virginia and the southern states could muster only 4,000 Catholics among them, and the great majority of the priests—the total was only 34—were naturally located in the sections where the greater number of Catholics were to be found.<sup>2</sup> Compared with the total population in the two sections, there were some 23,000 Catholics among about 760,000 inhabitants in what may be termed the "Catholic" section of the country, while in the rest of the country, the "non-Catholic," or more properly the "anti-Catholic," section, there were 4,000 Catholics scattered here and there among a total population of nearly two and one-half millions, a contrast that becomes all the more remarkable as one traces the wondrous change that time has wrought in the various localities of this section into which the immigration of the century has unceasingly poured.

To return now to the estimate of Bishop Carroll. Although some few have been disposed to consider it below the actual figure, it seems quite probable that this estimate must have included nearly all the Catholics actually ministered to at the time.<sup>3</sup> However,

(1885 ed.). His estimate is 32,500, including 8,000 colored, in 1784, based on a letter from Marbois to Vergennes. The pertinent passage is also to be found in Thos. P. Phelan, *Catholic Patriotism in Revolutionary Days*, in the *Catholic Historical Review*, N.S. I, Jan., 1922, p. 431. Humphrey, *Nationalism and Religion in America*, p. 234, quotes Carroll's 1785 estimate as 18,200. According to R. H. Nichols, *The Growth of the Christian Church*, p. 173, there were 18,000 Catholics in 1783. Thos. D'Arcy McGee, *A History of the Irish Settlers in North America*, p. 75, holds, without evidence, that "100,000 would be nearer the mark."

<sup>2</sup> According to Bishop Carroll there were nineteen priests in Maryland and five in Pennsylvania. Cf. Shea, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 259.

<sup>3</sup> In some unpublished letters Bishop Carroll refers to Catholics in frontier districts who were without the ministrations of their religion because he had no trustworthy priests whom he could assign to them.

undoubtedly a distinction should be made between those who were known to be Catholics, who to some extent, at least, were provided with the ministrations of their religion, and those who were left quite without the aid of religion, although they were probably not indifferent to their faith. It may reasonably be estimated, therefore, that among these faithful dispersed throughout the land there were, at the very highest, eight thousand out of touch with the Church who considered themselves Catholics, but whose children, on the other hand, were doomed in their isolation to lose the faith unless soon brought into contact with the Church. The Catholic population of the United States in 1789 may therefore be estimated at 35,000.

A further point which must be borne in mind is that we are dealing with a situation quite unprecedented in the annals of the Church. It must not be forgotten that the colonies which formed later the United States do not present the usual case of a national or semi-national apostasy to explain the lack of Catholicity in a civilized country, as was the case with Germany, England, Sweden and Norway. Here in the newly founded Republic one is confronted with a situation altogether different; here was a land throughout the greater section of which Catholicity had as yet failed to gain a foothold, a section in which organized Catholicity was as yet non-existent, and the task that presented itself to the Church was on that account doubly difficult for there were not even the remnants or ruins of a former structure on which to build—the foundation had to be laid from the very beginning, and generally in the face of outspoken, rampant and legalized hostility.

Moreover, in the history of colonial conditions as briefly indicated in the foregoing pages, is to be found the solution of much that is puzzling in the history of the Church after the establishment of the hierarchy. If there were 35,000 Catholics in the United States in 1789 there was also undoubtedly a large number of former Catholics and their descendants who constituted an ever-growing body, from mere natural accretion alone, a fact which goes far to explain the presence of the "lost tribes" in different sections of the country. While it would be futile and unwarranted to claim that during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries none of the immigrants lapsed, it will be apparent from the facts to be adduced in the course of this study that the most probable explanation of the presence in certain sections of so many indubitably Catholic names on the membership rolls of Protestant Churches is due to early conditions.

It is necessary here to compare the number of Catholics with the number of potential Catholics (exclusive, of course, of real Protestant stock) in the United States in 1789. To make this

comparison it is necessary to trace as far as possible the source of the immigration into this country during the colonial period. In other words, it is necessary to estimate the nationality or racial origin of most of the inhabitants of the United States in 1789. From these figures as a basis we must in turn, according to the percentage of Catholics in the mother countries, and according to the circumstances which would at different times tend to lessen or increase the proportion of Catholics migrating, estimate the number here who were of Catholic ancestry though no longer among the children of the Church. In discussing this question special attention must be given to the Irish, who are especially charged with having apostatized in this country, and who make up such a large share of the nineteenth-century immigration.

### I. IRISH IMMIGRATION BEFORE 1790

Since the days when Columban, and Aidan, and Columbanus, and their companions, that glorious galaxy of Irish saints and monks, made their way to the neighboring islands and spread throughout the continent of Europe, carrying to the tribes whom they met the culture, and the art, and the religion of their native isle, their countrymen have ever been found wherever the traveler's caravan or the adventurer's vessel could make its way. Urged on by zeal for the spread of their holy religion, as well as by a certain natural, innate desire for novelty and adventure, they had impressed their stamp on the civilization of Europe hundreds of years before the self-righteous Henry and his cohorts in the twelfth century inaugurated that sad series of chapters in the history of Ireland, to which even today "finis" is yet to be written; that heart-rending chronicle of the depopulation of Ireland, of the dispersal of its sons and daughters, reaching its culmination in the nineteenth century when the number of the inhabitants of that harassed land decreased steadily, decade by decade, by nearly four million souls. To America turned this human tide when the British began to found their colonies on the eastern seaboard, or to seize those already established.

At first a negligible stream, this emigration, after the middle of the eighteenth century, began to assume more notable proportions, presaging, as it were, and foreshadowing the wholesale exodus of the nineteenth century. By 1790, the Irish element constituted approximately seventeen per cent of the total white population of the United States, a statement which is almost indisputable, as will appear shortly, although the first Government census, taken in that year, recorded only 61,534 or about two per cent as the Irish element present in the country at that time.\* The

\* Cf. *C. P. G.*, 121.

chief reasons why the census listed such a small number are, first, because special attention was paid to the basis "heads of families" of whom there were few among the Irish, at the time, according to the standard of the census officials; secondly, because, the census lists as Irish only those of Irish birth, whereas not only the Irish born but their descendants are here included; and thirdly, because so many Irish when transported had lost their national or racial identity due to the iniquitous compulsory change of surname before or even after deportation. To trace in an absolutely accurate, statistical manner this tide of Irish emigration to the shores of America from its first rising is, of course, impossible owing to the absence of complete and systematic data on the subject. Nevertheless a brief historical consideration of the conditions in Ireland, of the religious and political situation in the island and the results upon the inhabitants during the years in question, coupled with the information obtainable from the early records of the colonies, from the newspapers, periodicals, court records and vital statistics, makes possible a safely conservative and well-founded estimate of the Irish element in the United States in 1790. This we will now undertake.

Briefly, then, with the exception of the reign of James II, who by his well-meant but blundering tactics succeeded only in bringing down upon the defenseless heads of those whose lot he would have alleviated, an even more virulent storm of violent intolerance, the seventeenth century was for Ireland a period of savage persecution, of ruthless and bloody repression, of refined and insidious extirpation of all that savored of toleration and liberty of conscience; a period, moreover, be it remembered, during which the dissenting Protestants, the Nonconformists, suffered hardly less than their Catholic brethren, whom in turn they drove to desperation during that hapless decade of the Commonwealth, when Cromwell had ensconced himself in the seat of power. The Catholic Irish, seeking a refuge, turned naturally at first to their neighbors in the faith and were found by the thousands rallying around the standards of Spain and France. The Irish Nonconformists, on the other hand, made their way with their English compeers to the newly founded colonies of America, which served as a refuge for the Protestants who refused to accept the episcopacy of the English Church.

To Virginia, in the second quarter of this century, came some of these refugees as is attested by the Irish names to be found in the early archives of the colony, at least 300 being present before the year 1666.<sup>5</sup> In 1634 the Massachusetts colony set apart a plot of land on the Merrimac river for the Irish and in 1640 Cotton

<sup>5</sup> Greer, *Early Immigrants to Virginia (1623-1666)*, quoted in O'Brien, *A Hidden Phase of American History*, p. 325.

Mather estimated that there were then in New England 4,000 Presbyterians,<sup>6</sup> of whom a goodly number must have been Irish. In 1669 some Irish came to South Carolina on board an English ship,<sup>7</sup> but later becoming discouraged they migrated to other sections of the colonies, 500 of them settling near Philadelphia in 1719.

Thus far reference has been to traces of that migration which occurred under the two Jameses and the two Charleses, most of which was Presbyterian from the north of Ireland. In the last years of Charles I there took place among the Catholics the insurrection of 1641 and the consequent struggle with the British, which was to end only after Oliver Cromwell had arrived in the unhappy island to overrun it and crush it beneath his ruthless heel. By 1651 the deed had been accomplished, and the consequent deportation of thousands began. Between 1651 and 1654, 6,400 victims of Cromwellian, English, savagery were torn from their homes and transported as felons and servants to the Barbados and to the American colonies. Thousands were shipped in the following years, the total being variously stated as between 60,000 and 100,000.<sup>8</sup> Sad as this recital is, it is only a partial record of the woes of Ireland under this cruel rule, for these thousands were the wives and children of the leaders and their followers whom Cromwell and his successors had encouraged and allowed to depart from their native land, after their surrender to the conqueror. In this manner, as chieftain after chieftain bowed beneath the yoke, each sailed with his yeomen for the Catholic powers, Spain, France, Austria, Venice, which offered a position in their armies. Thus the land had already been despoiled of between thirty and forty thousand of the flower of its manhood, when the innocent and defenseless families remaining behind were scattered among the colonies of the New World.

With the restoration of the monarchy under Charles II, dissenters and Catholics were again persecuted alike and when James II in his brief reign sought to introduce principles of toleration in his treatment of Ireland, the dissenters, rejoicing indeed at this humane course but resenting that the hated Papists should also share in the benefits accruing, aided in ousting the objectionable James from his throne. Under William III, whom the Protestants had placed in power in England, Parliament enacted in successive waves of fanatical fury to the dismay of the dissenters as well as of the Catholics the Toleration Act of 1689 and the Occasional Conformity Act. All the intolerance of a refined penal code and all the evil provisions of the various statutes of Charles

<sup>6</sup> Baird, *Religion in America*, p. 73.

<sup>7</sup> O'Brien, *op. cit.*, p. 350.

<sup>8</sup> Lingard and Belloc, *The History of England*, vol. VIII, p. 357.

II, the Corporation Act, the Conventicle Act, the Five Mile Act, and the Test Act, were once more put in force. Iniquitous customs, impost and commerce laws were passed, and religious freedom and material prosperity were doomed in Ireland. Emigration to America steadily increased, the Catholics making their way chiefly to Maryland and Pennsylvania. Thousands of dissenters in the industrial north of Ireland were forced to leave from lack of employment as well as for religious reasons. It is estimated that as many as 40,000 weavers alone were thus deprived of their means of livelihood in one year, 1699.<sup>9</sup>

Consequently, from the opening years of the eighteenth century practically until the American war for Independence, the Penal Code continued in full force, and the Irish element in the colonies constantly increased. In 1719 one hundred families from Ulster established themselves in New Hampshire. Between 1717 and 1734 several Irish settlements sprang up around Philadelphia, among them being included those migrants from South Carolina, already mentioned, whom misfortune and sickness had caused to despair of success in that locality. Between 1723 and 1726 six thousand Irish immigrants arrived in Pennsylvania while the population of Maryland was constantly being increased in the same way.

The first continued and measurable stream of immigration is the influx from 1729 to 1750. According to an early American writer<sup>10</sup> 6,000 arrived in the first year of that period while the annual average is placed at 12,000, most of the immigrants, it is claimed, coming from the north of Ireland. Indications of individual currents, or rather of the fountain springs, of the larger stream, are evident in the recorded statement that in 1727, Irish immigrants to the number of 1,127 landed on the banks of the Delaware; that in 1728 they had reached a total of 5,600; and that 2,000 arrived at Newcastle, Delaware, in one week in 1729.<sup>11</sup> In 1737 many husbandmen and laborers from Ireland settled in South Carolina, their number being constantly increased, 1,600 coming from the north of Ireland in the first years of the seventh decade of this century.<sup>12</sup> In 1743 there was a tract of land about 150 miles long, on the route between Virginia and Georgia, populated so predominantly by Irish that it was known as the "Irish Tract." In New York about the year 1757 Ulster and Orange counties (significant names) were peopled largely by Irish colonists.

It has been estimated that 35,000 sailed from three Ulster ports,

<sup>9</sup> *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. VIII, p. 133.

<sup>10</sup> Baird, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

<sup>11</sup> Baird, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

<sup>12</sup> O'Brien, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

Belfast, Derry and Newry, for the American colonies in the period from 1771 to 1773. Young<sup>13</sup> says the movement in this period was 17,350, while a contemporary sea-captain estimated the number who came during the first six months of 1773 alone as 18,000. The various estimates on the Irish immigration during these and adjacent years are not in complete agreement, but, striking the mean, it amounted to about 100,000 between the years 1767 and 1774. In addition to the fairly precise records cited in the foregoing paragraphs there is extant abundant evidence of the general presence of the Irish throughout the various colonies; evidence contained in the registers and state papers of the period; in the marriage and birth records, the wills, articles of conveyance, and notations of various transactions which contain a mine of information and historical lore, though they do not lend themselves readily to the purposes of the statistician.

It is now possible to attempt an estimate of the number of Irish and those of Irish descent in the United States in 1790, with assurance of a close approach to accuracy, for the data, although not absolute, are nevertheless reliable and trustworthy. Previous to the year 1729 the Irish immigration was spasmodic and sporadic and consequently hard to determine, but it may be estimated at about 30,000. From 1729 to 1750 the average annual immigration was about 12,000; and from 1767 to 1774 the number reached about 14,000 a year. On the data available for the period from 1750 to 1767 it is conservative to estimate that the immigration during these years reached an annual average of 5,000. The total Irish immigration to the colonies previous to their struggle for independence was therefore approximately 490,000. Since it was not until 1729 that any considerable influx is to be noted, the factor of natural increase among this body is confined chiefly to a period of somewhat less than fifty years. In determining this natural increase, account must be taken of the conditions under which the population in question had migrated. The hardships and suffering consequent upon the persecution previous to their departure from their native land, not to speak of the terrible conditions on the ships which conveyed them hither, had weakened their constitutions, depleted their strength and sapped their vitality, and the difficult conditions to be faced in the New World coupled with these facts worked toward lowering the net rate of natural increase. Accordingly if the Irish growth here be traced decade by decade from 1729 on, adopting, because of the circumstances, a rate of natural increase somewhat lower than usual, it is reasonable to estimate that there were in the United States in 1790 about 550,000 persons of Irish birth or descent, an estimate which is in substantial agreement with computations made by various authorities who

<sup>13</sup> *Tour in Ireland*, vol. II, p. 30.

reject the low figure recorded in the first census of the United States already referred to.<sup>14</sup>

It remains to determine what percentage of this immigration, what proportion of these 550,000, were Catholics or the descendants of Catholics. All the data go to prove and all authorities are agreed that by far the greater portion were Protestants.<sup>15</sup> As we have seen, the historical conditions, the political and the religious situation, were constantly driving from their homes the Non-conformist Protestants as well as the Catholics, and the fact that with few exceptions the latter had to expect in the colonies the same treatment that was their lot at home, led the majority of those that voluntarily emigrated, to seek an asylum elsewhere than in America. Apart from the few included among the original settlers of Lord Baltimore's Maryland colony, the first notable accession of Catholic stock consisted of the miserable victims of Cromwell's deportation policy. Of these, between twenty-five and thirty thousand, mostly defenseless women and children, may have arrived in the American colonies. The children, like the Janizaries of the Turks, were, as a rule, brought up by their captors to hate and despise the religion of their ancestors. To Maryland and Pennsylvania later, however, came a number of Catholics, while not a few were scattered among the other colonies. Accordingly, in view of the facts adduced in the present chapter, it may be estimated that of the above-mentioned 550,000, about 400,000 were of Protestant stock, while probably between 100,000 and 150,000 were of Catholic origin or descent.<sup>16</sup>

In sad contrast with the latter figure stands the estimated number of Catholics actually present in the United States at the end of the war of Independence—35,000 or about one-fourth the number of Irish Catholics alone who should have been enumerated at the time. If the Irish element among the American Catholics of that day be estimated at 25,000 there appears to have been a loss to the Church of 125,000 among the Irish immigrants to this country previous to 1790. The theological aspect of this fact need not detain us; assuredly few of these unfortunates were at fault in the loss of their faith; certainly those who had been deported had hardly the slightest chance of retaining their faith under the circumstances, while the voluntary immigrants are more to be pitied than blamed, if in fleeing from unbearable conditions at home, they succeeded only in surrounding themselves with an equally or even more intolerable environment abroad. What does chiefly interest us here, however, is the bearing that this early loss had on the

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Hanna, *The Scotch-Irish*, vol. I, p. 83; Ford, *The Scotch-Irish in America*, p. 220.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Baird, *op. cit.*, p. 42 and *passim*; Young, *op. cit.*, *passim*, especially vol. II, p. 56, ed. 1892; Hanna, *op. cit.*, I, 622.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. O'Brien, *op. cit.*, p. 266.

later history of the Church in this country. Naturally these "lost tribes" of Irish Catholics in America, growing constantly by natural accretion, presented a phenomenon which, to those who do not go beneath the surface, is explained by positing a continual apostasy on the part of the Irish immigrants. For these commentators this latter is the only explanation for the presence of such typically Catholic surnames as Kelly, Sullivan and Murphy in the ministry and in the membership of the sects, whereas the eighteenth-century loss was a factor of far-reaching effects, although we are far from denying that there were any apostasies among the Irish in the nineteenth century. This point will be treated more at length in a later chapter. We come now to a consideration of the other nationalities who made up the American population in 1790.

## II. GERMANS AND DUTCH IN THE UNITED STATES, 1790

An explanation of the rise of German emigration to the American colonies, and of the religious complexion of these emigrants, is to be found in the conditions of the Peace of Westphalia, a treaty among the terms of which were included many stipulations concerning religion and religious freedom, since it brought to a close the Thirty Years' War (1648), the last essentially religious struggle to be decided by force of arms. According to this pact, three, but only three, religions were thereafter to be permitted in the Empire: the Catholic religion, the Augsburg Confession (the latter having been legalized in 1555 by the Religious Peace of Augsburg), and Calvinism. Furthermore the limitation of legalization to these creeds was re-enforced by the retention and extension of the "*jus reformati*," the principle that the ruler of a principality, upon conversion, could compel his subjects also to change their religion. Though limited in the treaty to the *status quo* of 1624 yet this measure clothed each ruler with authority and pretext to see to it that in the future no new religion should gain legal sanction in his realm.

However, the attempt to limit Protestantism to two sects was futile, and there grew up such a numerous and, from the point of view of the authorities, such a troublesome "nonconformist" element, that repression and persecution, especially in the Protestant principalities, where the rise of new sects chiefly occurred, were resorted to as the then natural method of dealing with the problem. Prominent among the new sects were the Mennonites, Schwenkfelders, Pietists, Herrnhuters, and Quakers, the latter, through one of their leaders, William Penn, forming the chief bond that linked Germany with the American colonies. Fox, the English founder of the Society of Friends, had in 1655 sent representatives to pro-

mulgate his doctrines in Germany, and Penn had visited that country in 1671 and 1677, meeting with considerable success. Naturally, then, when he founded his American colony there were some German Quakers among the original colonists. While individual Germans had made their way to America previous to 1683, it was in this year that the first notable body immigrated, a band of religious refugees from the Palatinate founding Germantown near Philadelphia, and in a few years several other German communities of the same origin had sprung up nearby. With the beginning of the eighteenth century the Palatines made their way in large numbers to England, nearly 13,000 arriving in London between May and October, 1709. About 2,700 of these are found in New York in the following year, establishing the community of Newburgh and several hamlets in the Quassaick district, whence they spread into the Schoharie section and into Pennsylvania. That this original immigration was exclusively Protestant is apparent from the fact that when the London Board of Trade was coping with the problem of providing for the Palatine strangers who had descended upon them in such numbers, they solved it partially by sending back to the Palatinate all Catholics—about one-tenth of the whole number were of this faith—who would not embrace Protestantism.<sup>17</sup> Besides the 2,700 many others succeeded in reaching America via Ireland, whither 3,800 had been sent from England to settle in the province of Munster, on land confiscated from the rightful owners and handed over to the newcomers. In 1709 about 600 Palatines from England settled in Carolina, founding Newbern, situated in the present state of North Carolina.

Between 1710 and 1727 a steady increase in the German immigration, especially through the port of Philadelphia, occurred, reaching at times as high a figure as from five to eight thousand per year, the influx being so noticeable that agitation was raised against the Germans at times by the earlier settlers of other racial stocks. These new immigrants were in part Mennonites, Dunkards and Schwenkfelders, but the majority were Lutherans, Reformed, and United Brethren (Herrnhuters). From 1727 on, the Philadelphia immigration was recorded, and we consequently know that 68,872 Germans arrived between that year and 1775. There were accordingly about 120,000 Germans in Pennsylvania alone in 1790. Among these the Catholics were not numerous, there being three congregations in 1757 with an aggregate membership of 900 persons.

In the other colonies there was a constant German immigration during the same period. In New Jersey and Maryland many Lutheran and German Reformed had settled. The western portion of Virginia, especially the Shenandoah valley, was dotted with

<sup>17</sup> Faust, *The German Element in the United States*, vol. I, p. 78.

German settlers. In South Carolina the present counties of Lexington and Orangeburg were then known as the Saxe-Gotha district, the colonists for the most part being from that section of Germany, induced to come by the bounty offered for foreign Protestants settling in Carolina. In North Carolina was founded at Winston-Salem the Moravian community which still exists there; in Georgia 1,200 Salsburger Protestants had arrived as early as 1741; and in Massachusetts, and in Maine, then a portion of the Bay colony, four townships had been appropriated for foreign (that is to say, chiefly German) Protestants in 1749.

The entire German population in the colonies in 1775 was, accordingly, about 250,000, of whom the vast majority were Protestant as the facts adduced so far go to prove. By 1790 this number had been considerably increased by the presence of about 12,000 German mercenaries, chiefly Hessians and therefore predominantly Protestant, who had settled down in the new republic after the close of hostilities. The total German element in the colonies at this time is generally estimated by authorities at about 360,000.

Another Teutonic factor to be considered is the Dutch, who are Low Germans and of the same racial stock as the inhabitants of Germany, located in the low countries along the German seas. With the Dutch who founded New Amsterdam the religious motive was not so prominent as the commercial in attracting settlers to the new land, yet there early existed a statute forbidding the external practice of any religion except the Dutch Reformed. It is true this law was on the books but one year, being promulgated in 1640 and repealed in 1641; it is however an indication of the religious temper and complexion of the colony. Practically the entire early Dutch immigration to the colonies took place before 1664, the year in which the English took possession, although a few may have entered in 1673 and 1674 during the brief Dutch restoration of the colony on the occasion of the war of France and England against Holland. There were in New York in 1664 from 7,000 to 10,000 Dutch who are estimated to have increased to about 200,000 by 1790. Adding to the latter figure 40,000 as representing the Dutch element in the rest of the colonies, the total in the United States in 1790 was 240,000.<sup>18</sup>

The combined total of the two German elements in the American population of 1790 was accordingly about 600,000. We are here concerned only with those among them who were Catholics or of Catholic descent, and an estimate of this element is not easy. One thing is certain, namely that the proportion of Catholic stock among the German (including the Dutch) immigrants did not even approximate the proportion in the old countries. Conditions

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Faust, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 17.

in America, as we have seen, were not conducive to a large Catholic immigration to the colonies; moreover, in Germany, the Catholic religion remained at all times the dominant one in some sections, and legal in practically all sections. Hence the chief reason why any Catholics emigrated was the question of material prosperity. Germany, ravaged by the excesses of the Thirty Years' War, ravaged again in part by Turenne in 1674; Germany, a participant in the War of the Austrian Succession and the Seven Years' War, presented in many sections a pitiable spectacle of razed homes, ruined farms, and decayed industries. Even among the distinctively Protestant bodies of emigrants some Catholics, then, were included, as was the case with the Palatines in England. At the most there could not have been more than 100,000 Germans (including Dutch) of Catholic stock in the United States in 1790, and while that figure may seem large to some, it is here adopted as probably approximately correct. On the other hand, there were among the 35,000 actual Catholics hardly more than 8,000 Germans, a great portion of these being situated in Pennsylvania. As with the Irish we must write down a heavy loss to the Church among her German immigrants; a loss of about 92,000 souls, who had ceased to be Catholics either personally or due to the defection of their ancestors, mainly because of the utter lack of ministration, and the hopeless religious conditions in which the majority found themselves in America.<sup>19</sup>

### III. FRENCH IN THE UNITED STATES TO 1790

The French immigration to the New World during the period under discussion was of a twofold character: that to Canada, which was fostered by the Government of France, which remained as a rule in touch with and subject to the authorities at home, and which was almost exclusively Catholic; and that to the English colonies, the present United States, which consisted almost entirely of Huguenot refugees seeking to escape from the conditions in France which they found intolerable.

At a very early date, even as early as the sixteenth century, the faith was carried to Canada by the pioneer settlers of the land and by the first quarter of the seventeenth century a goodly number of Catholics gave happy augury of the bright future that was in store for the Church in New France. Slightly retarded by the brief period of English possession from 1629 to 1632, the peaceful French invasion steadily persisted, so that in 1659 the hierarchy was established, in 1668 a preparatory seminary was

<sup>19</sup> In regard to the facts adduced in the present section, cf. especially Faust, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

founded, and in 1678 a theological seminary was opened. In 1713 the Catholic population was 18,000, in 1739 it had grown to 42,000, in 1763 it was 70,000, and in 1784 it had reached 130,000.

Had it not been for external events, which in themselves should have concerned Canada but little, if at all, but which, however, had far-reaching results upon her internal history, the annals of New France would have only the slightest relation to the present study. From time to time colonists from Canada had moved down into the territory below the St. Lawrence; they had founded Detroit, had settled in the Ohio valley, and a few had even made their way into New England, the result of a voluntary and more or less peaceful migration, in which the immigrants were, as a rule, successful in establishing in their new home the same standard of living, the same religious organization under which they had dwelt in their former habitat. The tidal wash of European wars in the eighteenth century, sweeping with destructive force onto the American continent, wrought a great change: England had long resented the presence of France in the New World; she and her American colonies had ever cast covetous eyes at New France; under Cromwell the English had acquired Acadia only to cede it back in 1667, and accordingly when the War of the Spanish Succession furnished the pretext, English and colonial troops promptly attacked the French in Acadia, which had long and often been the objective of their piratical raids and bloody assaults. By the treaty of Utrecht, ending the war in 1713, England gained possession of Acadia (Nova Scotia), Newfoundland and the Hudson Bay Territory. As was to be expected, the Catholic inhabitants of the territory, then numbering about 2,000,<sup>20</sup> immediately became the object of a systematic and determined religious persecution, the purpose of which was to destroy their religion and make of them "true Englishmen." Although the Acadians took an oath of allegiance to the English king, and although they remained so loyal to this oath that on more than one occasion they refused to assist French expeditionary forces sent against their English captors, the persecution persisted in all its rigor. Finally in 1755 the Acadians who had in the intervening period repeatedly tried to emigrate and had as repeatedly been prevented from doing so, suffered the cruellest blow that their rapacious and conscienceless persecutors could have devised. The English governors of Acadia smarted under their failure to destroy the faith of their alien subjects; the colonists planted in their midst envied their prosperous farms and busy industries; deportation of the recalcitrant populace, distribution of the individuals among the communities of the American, Protestant, colonies would satisfy all: deportation, unlike the voluntary emigration which they had desired, would

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *Catholic Encyclopedia*, I, p. 91, art. "Acadia."

destroy their collective entity and would countenance the confiscation of their property; deportation was therefore decided upon.

Men, women and children were ruthlessly seized as soon as the order was issued; hurried away from their homes, herded together, like cattle, in corrals until transportation could be provided, they were thrown into unsanitary crowded ships, families separated, children torn from their parents, husbands separated from their wives, and thus they were scattered along the Atlantic coast from Maine to Georgia. As the population of Acadia was 15,000 in 1750, and about 18,000 in 1755.<sup>21</sup> and as practically all the inhabitants were the victims of this terrible deed, it is safe to estimate that about 15,000 Catholics (estimates vary between 8,000 and 18,000) were thus marooned among the colonies, without taking into consideration those, immortalized by Longfellow in his story of *Evangeline*, who made their way to Louisiana.<sup>22</sup> In 1763 the Treaty of Paris gave all Canada to England as a result of the Seven Years' War and there followed another, though shorter and less violent persecution, which outwardly ceased in 1774 by the passage of the Quebec Act, when England began to read the handwriting on the wall, in the temper and actions of her original colonies. There were in 1790, then, some 25,000 French of Catholic stock in the United States, but, as with the Irish deportees, the majority had been robbed of their faith by the inhuman treatment they had received. The French in the United States, who had remained Catholic, numbered about 2,000 and were composed in greater part of the voluntary immigration which had settled chiefly around Detroit, Kaskaskia, Vincennes, and nearby hamlets.

A word may be said of the immigration which came from France directly to the colonies, but which, because of its Huguenot, Protestant, complexion, does not affect the estimate just advanced. The Reformation in France brought in its train a series of religious wars, an interminable succession of persecution and attack by both Catholics and Protestants wherever the one or the other party was in local power, interspersed with compromise and truce, ending in 1598 in the Edict of Nantes, in accordance with which the Huguenots were given full religious freedom. The political tendencies of the reformers, however, soon caused trouble again, and when in 1627 they made a treasonable alliance with England, the French Government besieged La Rochelle, their stronghold, which was forced to capitulate. During the long reign of Louis XIV

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *Cath. Encyc.*, *loc. cit.*; Edouard Richard, *Acadia*, vol. II, pp. 124 and 341.

<sup>22</sup> Louisiana did not at this time belong to the English colonies, it will be remembered. It is interesting to note that recently (1923) the Minister of Education for the Province of Ontario seriously attempted to bar the story of *Evangeline* from the textbooks in schools under his jurisdiction.

(1643 to 1715) the freedom of the Huguenots was gradually encroached upon; after 1660 they were less and less tolerated, until finally in 1685 the Edict of Nantes was revoked, Louis having been led to believe that there were practically no more Protestants left in his kingdom. Although in the revocation of the edict they were forbidden to emigrate, large numbers succeeded in making their way out of the country. That this emigration reached the enormous total of 500,000, as many Protestant authorities hold, is very much to be doubted, but it is a fact that some thousands settled in the American colonies. In Massachusetts public action was taken on behalf of these immigrants in 1662 and 1686, and in the latter year a French Protestant church was opened in Boston.<sup>23</sup> Between 1666 and 1703 naturalization acts for their benefit were passed in Maryland, Virginia, the Carolinas and New York, and in the latter colony, which boasted a New Rochelle, they had become so numerous that as early as 1656 public documents were published in French as well as in Dutch. It is unnecessary and useless to compute the total number of inhabitants of French stock in the country in 1790; the Government statistics, based on names of families at the time, list the number as 17,619.<sup>24</sup> The true number is probably nearer 100,000; the point that concerns us is that the Catholic proportion in France does not apply here. It may be estimated that there were about 75,000 of Huguenot stock, and about 25,000 of Catholic stock, but as the latter were chiefly the Acadian deportees, there were, as has already been pointed out, in all probability not more than 2,000 actual French Catholics in the country at the time of its establishment. There had consequently been a loss to the Church, mostly involuntary and inculpable, as has been seen, of about 23,000 of this nationality.

---

In the foregoing analysis of the national elements present in the population of the newly formed United States and in the estimate of the distribution of this factor among the Catholics of the time, no separate treatment of the English has been made. Such omission is due to the fact that although the English constituted the majority in the early population of our country only a negligible number of them were Catholics. The number of Catholics in England at the time hardly more than equalled the number in the colonies; the vast majority of the inhabitants had apostatized during the Reformation and in the persecutions that followed, while the greater number of those who became refugees for their faith fled rather to the Continent than to America.

Summing up the facts presented in this chapter, we find that of the total population of the United States at the time of the

<sup>23</sup> This church was sold to the Catholics about a century later.

<sup>24</sup> C.P.G., p. 121.

## 52 HAS THE IMMIGRANT KEPT THE FAITH?

first census approximately 275,000 were of Catholic descent; that there were actually only about 35,000 Catholics;<sup>25</sup> and that consequently the Church had suffered here a loss of 240,000 members or possible members by the year 1790. This loss which on the surface seems to have been American is in reality to be set down to the effects of the Reformation in England, of which it was in effect the back-wash.

Therefore, since we are considering the growth of the Church in the United States we must in all fairness strike off from the books any loss which occurred before the nation gained her independence. It must be considered as of 1790, not of 1900 or 1920, although when compounded through the decades, it amounted by natural growth of this original body alone, to some two or three millions in the latter year. With the close of the War of Independence and the establishment of the National Government and the foundation of the hierarchy by the Church, there opened up to Catholics a vista, which though by no means ideal, was yet calculated to offer sanguine hopes of a sturdy growth. Let us proceed, in our inventory of ecclesiastical conditions, to a brief résumé of the actual state of the Church in the new nation, as a preliminary to the study of its growth.

<sup>25</sup> For the benefit of those who may be inclined to hold that 35,000 is too small an estimate of the 1790 Catholic population it is well to note the relatively unimportant bearing of this figure upon the study as a whole. Even were we to take 100,000 as the Catholic population of 1790 this would make in the 1920 figures a difference of only 845,000. The solution of the problem of loss and gain lies in a study of Catholic immigration, not in a study of the growth of the pre-Revolutionary Catholics of this country.

## CHAPTER III

### THE CHURCH IN 1790

Although the subject has already been touched upon in the preceding pages it will not be inopportune to set forth here a brief summary of the membership and the legal status of Catholics in each of the thirteen original states at the time of the adoption of the constitution, and to give a brief description of the internal condition of the Church.

Catholicity had as yet hardly a foothold in New England: so scattered and few were the faithful that when in 1784 Fr. Carroll, as newly appointed prefect apostolic, made a visitation of the territory under his jurisdiction, he deemed it useless to proceed further north than New York. The first church in Massachusetts was founded in 1788; in 1790 there were 200 Catholics in the state, and in 1798 there were 210 according to a report made to Bishop Carroll. In Maine, then a part of Massachusetts, Catholicity was confined chiefly to the Indians. Vermont, which became a state in 1793, had few Catholics and these, being so far from Baltimore and so inaccessible from there, were looked after by the Bishop of Quebec even subsequent to 1789. Indeed, there were no resident priests in Vermont until many years of the nineteenth century had passed. In New Hampshire the Catholic Church did not get a foothold until 1822, while Bishop Fenwick of Boston informs us three years later that there were then 150 Catholics in the state. Of Connecticut much the same is to be said as of New Hampshire; as late as 1835 Bishop Fenwick's census listed only 720 Catholics. In Rhode Island, also, Catholicity was slow in becoming organized and in 1820 the Catholics, numbering about 1,000, received their first resident priest from Bishop Fenwick, the first church being built in 1829. In Georgia and the Carolinas there were very few Catholics and no organization until after the Revolution and the establishment of the new Government, while the situation of the Church in Virginia was not much more promising, there being 200 Catholics in that section in 1785, ministered to by a priest from Maryland four or five times a year. In New Jersey and Delaware there were a few scattered Catholics, and in New York the number of Catholics was estimated in 1785 as 1,500, without a priest to minister to them until the arrival that year of an Irish priest for whom they had sent. Maryland had in 1785 about 12,800 white

Catholics and 19 priests, while there were 5 priests in Pennsylvania to minister to the 7,000 Catholics there. The 3,000 Catholics around Detroit and those scattered through the Northwest Territory which had been organized in 1787, though numerous in a sense, were in a precarious position owing to the political vicissitudes which that section had suffered.

The legal position of Catholics in the new Republic was not of a very promising nature. The Federal Constitution provides that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." The first Congress, in 1789, passed certain amendments which, after ratification by the states, came into force in December, 1791. The first clause in the first amendment, usually, but quite incorrectly, referred to as granting religious liberty in the United States, reads as follows: "Congress shall make no law regarding an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

This first statement in the "Bill of Rights," as the ten amendments were known, is significant, but far from being the result of action or petition on the part of the Catholics, it was only partly the grudging concession of persons who were won to this view, although originally they had been opponents of the Constitution itself because of the very fact that Article VI eliminated all question of religious test or oath as a qualification for Government service. However, although this first amendment was actually something of a guarantee of Catholic rights there is only the slightest evidence to show that this view was consciously present in the minds of the originators. The Bill of Rights, including the religious clause under discussion, originated not in the mind of one or two men, and most assuredly was it not the result of the influence of Bishop Carroll and his brother Daniel who was a member of the constitutional convention, and one of the original signers of the Constitution as well as a member of the first Congress.<sup>1</sup>

One who puts forth such a view forgets the circumstances of the birth of the Bill of Rights. When the Constitution was submitted to the people widespread dissatisfaction was expressed, and in some sections the disaffection was so violent that it was manifested by mob demonstrations. There was a general distrust of the central Government on the part of the sovereign states, and particularly was it feared that after having escaped the Scylla of King George and Parliament, they were about to fall into the Charybdis of a tyrannical Congress. An agitation resulted in the legislatures of the several states, and various amendments,—New York proposed as many as 32—were brought before Congress in 1789. Ten were finally passed by Congress in September, 1789, and an analy-

<sup>1</sup>Another Catholic, Thomas Fitzsimons, was also a signer of the Constitution.

sis of these shows clearly that the dominant idea present in the originators was to curb the powers of Congress—the freedom of the Catholic Church was certainly not an issue. The people—it is really more correct to specify “the States”—demanded freedom, they desired their rights safeguarded, not directly in themselves, for the States were the competent masters in these matters, according to the popular ideas, but from any possible domination of a future domineering Congress, which some seemed to fear might even be of a “Romish” complexion. If such an event should take place the Bill of Rights would see to it that the Catholic religion could not be appointed and declared the state religion!

Though the first amendment became part of the constitutional law of the land on Dec. 15, 1791, the true religious trend of the times is to be discerned in the provisions of the state constitutions which prevailed for many years thereafter. Although the Federal Constitution in Art. VI forbade any religious test as a qualification for a federal office, the various state constitutions were under no necessity to contain any such clause, and in point of fact several did prohibit Catholics from voting or holding office; and again, although Congress could not establish a national religion, or prohibit the free exercise of any religion, a state legislature could establish one, and some did; a state legislature could prohibit the free exercise of, let us say, the Catholic religion, and some in fact did institute what was tantamount to that very prohibition, and all this without in any way going contrary either to the spirit or the letter of the Federal Constitution.<sup>2</sup> In other words, the religious clauses in the Constitution had reference solely to action on the part of the national Government; the States—and the early days of the Republic were particularly the days of states rights—jealously retained unto themselves the rights they denied to Congress and the central Government.

To the various state constitutions<sup>3</sup> we must accordingly turn to obtain a true idea of the legal position of Catholics in the new nation.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> To state, as so many writers do, that the first Congress did all it could to ordain liberty of conscience in the new nation, is perhaps to state a half-truth, but it is as misleading a statement as the language is untechnical. Congress did absolutely nothing (perhaps that was all it could do) to ordain liberty of conscience: it had merely *prohibited itself* from ever restricting religious liberty. It in no way directly touched the powers of the states in that regard. We are not concerned here with the XIVth amendment or with the present-day development of the Constitution.

<sup>3</sup> The states in preparation for independence and entering the Union each adopted a constitution. Rhode Island, however, was not so provided until 1842. Connecticut adapted its royal charter to the new conditions, adopting a constitution only in 1818. Cf. Purcell, *Connecticut in Transition*, pp. 174 *seq.*

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Shea, *op. cit.*, p. 155; Cobb, *The Rise of Religious Liberty in America, passim*, especially chapter X.

New Hampshire which in 1679 required the oath of Supremacy and in 1696 imposed an obnoxious test oath on its citizens, retained in its constitution, adopted in 1792, many intolerant provisions. It provided for the support and maintenance of the public Protestant teachers, and required that the governor, counsellors, senators and members of the House of Representatives were all to be Protestants. Not until 1876 was this discrimination against Catholics removed, while even to the present day the clause empowering towns to provide for the maintenance of public Protestant teachers is obstinately retained, for although an attempt was made to repeal it in 1889 the act failed of ratification and the repeal did not take effect.

Puritan Massachusetts in its constitution of 1779-80 virtually retained Congregationalism as the established religion and further authorized towns to lay taxes "for the institution of the public worship of God, and the support and maintenance of public protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality," where such support was not voluntarily provided. In order to hold office all were obliged, under oath, to abjure all obedience to a foreign ecclesiastical power.<sup>5</sup> This oath remained in force until 1821, when it was modified, and it was not until 1833 that true religious liberty was granted in the Bay State.

New York in its constitution of 1777 included a clause refusing naturalization to any person who would not abjure all allegiance to any foreign potentate in matters ecclesiastical. This was the result of an amendment to the proposed act. The amendment was moved in the constitutional convention by John Jay, afterwards chief-justice of the United States and required the new subjects "to abjure and renounce all allegiance and subjection to all and every foreign king, priest, potentate, and state, in all matters ecclesiastical and civil."<sup>6</sup> Priests (ministers too), were expressly prohibited from holding office, while the oath of office prescribed, effectually prevented any Catholic from accepting an official position in the land once so honorably presided over by Thomas Dongan. In the same convention when the question of religious toleration was under discussion, Jay, whose later high office should have postulated on his part the possession of a more judicial and unbiased mind, sought to have passed an even more bigoted provision against Catholics. To the clause which declared "that the free toleration of religious profession and worship shall for ever here-

<sup>5</sup> A plain but sad commentary on the state officials and their intolerant attitude is seen in the fact that Governor Dudley of Massachusetts established a lecture at Harvard College, the purpose being that the lecturer should denounce, every year, popery and the Church of Rome. Both the governor and the lieutenant-governor were trustees of this college, which accepted the gift and its conditions. Cf. McMaster, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 501.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Bayley, *History of the Catholic Church in New York*, p. 52.

after be allowed to all mankind," he proposed to add the following: "Except the professors of the religion of the Church of Rome, who ought not to hold lands in or be admitted to a participation of the civil rights enjoyed by the members of this State, until such time as the said professors shall appear in the Supreme Court of this State, and there most solemnly swear, that they verily believe in their consciences that no pope, priest, or foreign authority on earth, hath power to absolve the subjects of this State from their allegiance to the same. And further, that they renounce and believe to be false and wicked the dangerous and damnable doctrine that the Pope, or any other earthly authority, hath power to absolve men from their sins, described in and prohibited by the Gospel of Jesus Christ; and particularly that no pope, priest, or foreign authority on earth hath power to absolve them from the obligation of this oath."<sup>7</sup> A milder clause was adopted, but the Catholic disabilities were not repealed until 1806.

Though New Jersey in her constitution of 1776 granted liberty of conscience, she restricted eligibility to be an officer of the state or a member of the legislature, to Protestants, a clause which remained in force until 1844.

In Connecticut, although there was no special discrimination against Catholics, the Congregational religion remained the established Church until 1818.<sup>8</sup>

South Carolina in its constitution of 1778 reserved membership in the legislature to Protestants, and established the "Christian Protestant" as the religion of the state, and granted equal civil and religious privileges to all denominations of Christian Protestants. These discriminatory clauses were, however, repealed in 1790. North Carolina similarly restricted office-holding to Protestants by its constitution of 1776, a change in 1835 opening offices to all Christians.

Georgia (constitution 1798) and Rhode Island (which did not adopt a constitution until 1842) had no express discrimination against Catholics in their legislation, but at the time of the adoption of the Federal Constitution virtually the only states where anti-Catholic penal laws were swept away were Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Virginia.<sup>9</sup>

The only logical conclusion to be drawn from the foregoing is that the provisions of the Federal Constitution had nothing to do with religious liberty in the states. Actually when the new central Government was established the Catholic religion was free and untrammelled in only four of the states; in two others conditions

<sup>7</sup> *Ib.*, p. 166.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Purcell, *op. cit.*, ch. IX.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Sanford H. Cobb, *The Rise of Religious Liberty in America*, chh. IX-X.

were tolerable ; while in seven the Church was the object of restrictions which could not help but retard her growth. We must remember, too, that the general cause underlying the gradual repeal of state constitutional religious clauses was not so much zeal and ardor for religious liberty as such ; it was rather the result of the united action of disestablished sects against the established Church which was in some cases the Episcopalian, in others the Congregational Church.<sup>10</sup>

The internal life of the Church presented almost as disheartening an aspect as did her external condition, for she was in truth a thing, not merely weak and timid and fearful of the future, she was racked by internal strife, she was torn by incipient schisms and even her leaders were averse to having bestowed upon her an organization and an entity which they at first alleged would be incompatible with conditions in the new democracy.

In Maryland, the cradle of Catholicity, the workers from the very beginning had been almost exclusively Jesuits. Here, unsupported by the faithful in material affairs, they had themselves provided for the maintenance of religion by the acquisition of land which they tilled and on which they erected their rude habitations. Unfortunately in so doing they came into conflict with Lord Baltimore, who held that his rights were being infringed upon,<sup>11</sup> especially because certain sections of land had been acquired from the Indians directly. It is not necessary to enter into the merits of the question, but as a result of the controversy the Jesuits from then (1642) on were accused by many of the Catholic leaders, and by some secular priests, of looking out for their own material interests to the detriment of the general welfare of the Church. The charge was due to a misunderstanding, but it had a most untoward effect on the Church even to the time of Bishop Challoner of England, who in the 1760's feared selfish opposition on the part of the Jesuits to the establishment of a vicariate apostolic or a bishopric in America.<sup>12</sup>

In 1773 occurred the suppression of the Society of Jesus by papal decree, an event which was fraught with danger to the Church in America since the missions of Maryland and Pennsylvania were at the time entirely in the hands of fathers of the Society. The natural result upon the priests was that a spirit of apathy replaced in their work the energy and enthusiasm with which they had formerly coped with the difficulties that beset them. By the decree of suppression all their property was liable to confiscation ; that Bishop Challoner, the executor of the decree for America, did not put this clause into effect,<sup>13</sup> because the

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Baird, *op. cit.*, Bk. III, ch. IV, *Dissolution of Church and State*.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Russell, *Maryland, Land of Sanctuary*, pp. 148, seq.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Guilday, *Life and Times of John Carroll*, p. 151.

<sup>13</sup> Guilday, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

Jesuits were almost the only ecclesiastics in the colonies, was fortunate for the Church here, since this property was necessary for the upkeep of the missions. Nevertheless the fear and uncertainty as to the future produced inevitably a detrimental result upon the shepherds of the flock and the administration of their charge.

Another factor which must be taken into consideration if one is to arrive at an intelligent appreciation of the state of Catholicity in 1790 is the question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. During the English colonial period in America the Church in England, as an organized body, was almost non-existent. It would take us too far afield to detail the conditions in England; it suffices to state that from 1634 to 1696 "there is no evidence for the exercise of any canonical rights over the colonies by the ecclesiastical superiors in England."<sup>14</sup> and naturally the untoward results of such a state of affairs can hardly be overestimated. In the latter year a decree of Innocent XII placed the regular (religious) priests in the colonies under an English vicar apostolic. The situation, however, was not much improved, for in 1715 the Maryland clergy expressed doubt or ignorance as to whether they were subject to London or to Quebec, and when a point of jurisdiction was referred to Rome for decision the answer did not help to clear the situation: "It will be hard to find under which Vicariate-Apostolic Maryland is—London too far—Quebec are foreigners."<sup>15</sup> In 1723 we find the first recorded claim of canonical jurisdiction over the colonies by the London vicariate, but it was not until 1757 that this claim was definitely confirmed, and from that year until 1784 this London jurisdiction was acknowledged.

The War for Independence complicated matters again. Nominally, Bishop Challoner of the London district was the ecclesiastical superior for the colonies, and actually, Father Lewis, his vicar-general here, was in authority, but on Challoner's death in 1781, his successor, Bishop Talbot, refused to exercise any jurisdiction over the American Church, while the latter denied at least in practice any power of jurisdiction to him.

Realizing that the future boded ill for the Church unless the question of its government were properly settled and, too, perhaps, somewhat imbued in ecclesiastical modes of thought with the then omnipresent spirit of independence and democracy in political and secular affairs, several representative priests met in council in 1783. They adopted a plan or constitution for the American Church, and sent a petition to Rome that one of their number should be granted jurisdiction over the Church in the now independent states.<sup>16</sup> Rome's answer was the appointment of

<sup>14</sup> Guilday, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

<sup>15</sup> Thos. Hughes, *History of the Jesuits in North America*, vol. II, p. 387.

<sup>16</sup> Shea, *op. cit.*, pp. 209, 211, 218, 223.

Fr. John Carroll as prefect apostolic, with the statement that he would be raised to the episcopate after detailed information in regard to the Church in America had reached Rome. This appointment of Carroll, although it would seem to have settled the troublesome question of jurisdiction definitively, in point of fact did not, for unfortunately a clause in the appointment denied him the right to give faculties to priests coming into his territory. This prohibition, included in the document through inadvertence, threatened to cause much delay, annoyance, and even positive harm to the Church, since, as a result, according to Fr. Carroll, nearly all the Catholics outside of Maryland and Pennsylvania were left destitute of spiritual succor. Happily this difficulty was obviated in 1785 when the Holy See granted to the prefect apostolic the necessary powers.

Nevertheless the path of the Church was not yet smooth. As stated in the preceding paragraph Rome in 1784 gave notice to the American priests that they would soon be given a bishop of their own. The almost unanimous resentment and opposition with which this momentous announcement was received is the clearest possible commentary on the state of the American Church at the time. In 1765 when the subject of the appointment of a vicar apostolic was being strongly agitated, especially in England, the laity in Maryland had drawn up a vigorously worded protest against such action, alleging chiefly the legal position of Catholics as militating against the advisability of the act at that time.<sup>17</sup> It must be admitted that the laity may subjectively have felt themselves quite justified in their "Remonstrance" since the Catholics in Maryland and Pennsylvania were suffering such severe persecution at the time that many of their influential members were on the point of moving to some more favorable locality. At any rate the matter was dropped until, as we have seen, Fr. Carroll, after the petition of the American priests, was appointed prefect apostolic in 1784. Be it noted, however, that in two points Rome's answer did not suit the petitioners. Carroll, instead of Lewis whom they had desired, was named prefect; and Rome, quite unexpectedly, and according to the claims of the Americans, quite unnecessarily, promised him a bishopric.

The timorousness, the timidity, the pusillanimity of the laity of 1765 was still fermenting, now in the leaven of the priesthood, for the chapter, fearful indeed in one sense, but quite independent in their instructions to Rome, resolved that a bishop was not necessary, and that if one should be appointed he should not be entitled to any support from the estates of the clergy, and a memorial to that effect was sent to Rome, alleging as justifying reasons the

<sup>17</sup> Guilday, *op. cit.*, p. 154, quoting Campbell, *The Beginning of the Hierarchy in the U. S.*

probable future jealousy of the Protestants and the lack of means to support a bishop.

It was not long, however, before the American sentiment veered. It became evident that the Government was not interested greatly in the establishment of the hierarchy here and, with the gradual subsidence of opposition from within, the American priests now (1788) sent a memorial requesting the appointment of a bishop. In 1789 Carroll was appointed, and with his consecration in 1790 the history of the American Church makes a new beginning.

A knowledge of the facts related in the preceding paragraphs helps greatly to an understanding of the evils which beset the Church during the prefecture and the early days of the episcopate of Bishop Carroll—evils which unfortunately were from time to time to crop out later in the history of the American Church. The uncertainty as to jurisdiction, and the opposition to the establishment of the episcopate, though in a lesser degree, resulted, inevitably so, in a rampant spirit of revolt, of rebellion, of independence, among priests and people. Commands and prohibitions, measures necessary for the welfare of the faithful and the Church were freely ignored and flouted so long as they emanated from a mere arch-priest, as were Fr. Lewis, the American vicar general of the London district, and Fr. Carroll, the prefect apostolic. By 1790 this habit had become so ingrained that even as Bishop, John Carroll could compel obedience only with the greatest difficulty and patience. Probably the dominant political ideas had permeated the realm of the spiritual. At any rate, several incipient schisms, at this time, in which both priests and people participated, give sad but conclusive evidence of the precarious state of the Church. Details are not in order here; it may suffice to mention the unfortunate Fr. de la Poterie, who, save the mark, was the founder of organized Catholicity in Boston (1788); his successor, Fr. Rousselet who was not a great improvement over him; Fr. Whelan in New York where he succeeded in alienating his congregation from the Church for a time; and the Helbron and Goetz disorder in Philadelphia. Hand in hand with the insubordination of the priests, sometimes as cause, sometimes as effect, went a rebellious and ultra-independent attitude on the part of the laity, who, through their trustees, in several cases claimed the custody, administration, and ownership of Church property, as well as the right to appoint and depose pastors.

It is not a pleasing picture that the candid student will paint of the Church in 1790. Insubordinate priests, a rebellious and haughty laity, high-minded in pride and insolence when their bishop was concerned, but pusillanimous and cringing when they faced their enemies; a Church poor in material resources, and from a legal point of view tolerated only under sufferance; a Church

whose members had in most cases never received the Holy Ghost in the sacrament of Confirmation,<sup>18</sup> whose departed brethren had generally gone before their Judge unconsoled by the comforting and strengthening rite of Extreme Unction,<sup>19</sup> and unshrive[n] by the sacrament of Penance; a congregation, composed in great part of weak-kneed adherents—such was the flock of which John Carroll was called to be chief shepherd and pastor. Stout-hearted though he was he quailed at the burden that had been placed upon him. Wise, prudent, cautious, influential, learned and pious, failure would have been his, and the little mustard seed would have been trampled beneath the heel of the passers by or choked by the thorns and the thistles had not divine grace guided him through the troublesome years.

<sup>18</sup> Generally there was no one with authority to administer, while those who had the faculty were seldom able to use it. Cf. Shea, "Petition of American Priests to Rome," *op. cit.*, p. 209.

<sup>19</sup> Usually no oils were at hand, and moreover distances were too great and priests too few and scattered. *Ibid.*

## CHAPTER IV

### CATHOLIC GROWTH FROM 1790 TO 1820

As sketched in the preceding chapter the outlook for the Church in 1790 was not promising. Nevertheless, despite the untoward aspect a remarkable growth is to be recorded from the very foundation of the hierarchy. Weak and despised though the Church was, poor and uninfluential though the majority of her members were, yet converts were even in these days drawn into the fold. It is in fact to converts, to Mr. Thayer and to the Barber family, that the beginnings of the Church in New England must in part be attributed, while the crowning glory of the early American Church, the Sisters of Charity of Emmitsburg, the first American religious order, was due to the energy and zeal of Mrs. Seton, their convert-foundress. In addition to some conversions and the natural increase, two other factors, accession and immigration contributed to the growth of the Church. Immigration has operated at all times, though in varying degrees, since the foundation of the Republic and the establishment of the hierarchy. As has already been indicated and as will be further apparent in later chapters, this factor has been the dominant one in the growth of the American Church, and to it special attention must be paid by one who would solve the vexing problem of loss and gain. We proceed now to a consideration of these sources of Catholic growth during the period from 1790 to 1820.

In considering the immigration during these years one must depend on semi-official estimates, since the Government did not begin to record such statistics until 1820. In order to arrive at an intelligent evaluation of the estimates, it is necessary to glance briefly at the historical background both in Europe and America, for immigration is not simply a blind movement of peoples, but is rather the natural result of political, and economic conditions, sometimes under their religious aspect, in the countries in which the immigration originates and terminates.

In Europe the period was marked by the French Revolution, the Irish uprising of 1798 and the Napoleonic wars; in America the effect of European conditions was severely felt in a decline of prosperity, while our War of 1812 was due chiefly to results brought about by the European debacle.

When in 1792 and the following years the progress of the French Revolution, a movement which Americans generally attributed and likened to their own struggle for independence, brought France into conflict with nearly all the rest of Europe, the admiration, sympathy and enthusiasm of the American populace for the beleaguered French was widespread and unbounded. Remembering the aid which France had brought to the hard-pressed colonies in the conflict which severed them from England, and mindful of the treaty of alliance which was a result of this action, the Jeffersonian-Republicans were advocating that active help should be given our former ally. Washington failed to coincide with the popular view and in 1793 issued a proclamation of neutrality. The question of neutrality centered around American maritime commerce which had grown to an unprecedented degree in carrying to the belligerent nations, especially France and England, necessary supplies, both from America and the West Indies. It would be tedious to trace here the American effort at neutrality. International law was not always clear on the points involved, and regardless of law neither Great Britain nor France scrupled to put into effect measures, which while they were ostensibly aimed at the enemy, had the practical result of ruining the commerce of America. In a few months hundreds of American vessels, with their valuable cargoes, were in the hands of the French and the British, and American commerce was at a standstill.

In 1795 war with England threatened; in 1798 war with France was imminent, and in fact in that year the American navy did attack and capture some French vessels in the West Indies. The French crisis was settled in 1800 when negotiations were entered into with Napoleon who was then in power. Great Britain, however, did not materially change her attitude, and relations with her became more and more strained until finally America declared war on her in 1812.

The effect of the European situation was varied in this country. The Franco-English War which began in 1793 brought at first prosperity to the commercial ports of America, despite the difficult situation in the last decade of the eighteenth century. The brief respite from hostilities in Europe from 1801 to 1803 caused a consequent depression in America, to be followed by four years of not entirely unalloyed prosperity which abruptly ceased in 1807 with the passage of American retaliatory measures, such as the Non-Importation Act of 1806 and the Embargo Act of 1807. After peace with Great Britain was declared in 1814 the depression continued, for the British West Indies were closed to American shipping, and British manufacturers flooded the Atlantic seaboard. On the other hand the introduction of a protective tariff in 1816 fostered the infant industries which had sprung up of

necessity when America was practically cut off from the world. Another important result was the emigration to the West, a movement which had begun in the depression following the War for Independence. So great was this migration during the present period that in the decade from 1810 to 1820 the population of New York city, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore registered only a comparatively slight increase, while Charleston registered a gain of only 69 inhabitants in these ten years.<sup>1</sup> Only a slow growth was shown throughout the East in general. By 1820 nine new states in the Mississippi valley had entered the Union.<sup>2</sup>

However, for the present purpose the immediate consequence of the events narrated in the preceding pages is the effect upon migration from Europe. Throughout the entire period conditions were not favorable to any widespread movement. Until the fall of Napoleon departure from Europe was difficult, for obvious reasons, while at the same time entrance into America was no easier, for the non-intercourse measures practically affected people as well as goods. After the fall of Napoleon the depression in America tended to cut down immigration and consequently the number of foreigners who entered the country between 1790 and 1820 is comparatively small. It is a difficult task to determine what was the total immigration during this time, since, as has been stated, no official statistics were generally kept.<sup>3</sup> The number of immigrants is variously estimated as between 225,000 and 274,000. A recent Government publication<sup>4</sup> estimates the amount as 250,000; the census of 1850 places it at 234,000,<sup>5</sup> that of 1860 at 274,000,<sup>6</sup> while other authorities have named as low a figure as 225,000. A reasonable working estimate would be 245,000.

It must not be supposed, however, that this estimate represents the net immigration; to estimate this latter figure it is necessary to deduct from the gross immigration the number of immigrants who fail to survive during the period under discussion, as well as those who leave the country. For the number of deaths among immigrants during this thirty-year period twelve per cent of the total is a conservative estimate;<sup>7</sup> as for the departures, the total

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Compendium of U. S. Census, 1850*, p. 192.

<sup>2</sup> For a complete account of historical events touched upon in the preceding pages cf. McMaster, *History of the American People*, vols. II, III and IV.

<sup>3</sup> For two years beginning in July, 1798, as a result of the anti-alien and especially the anti-French agitation, captains of ships entering American ports were required to keep a list recording the name, age and place of birth of foreigners coming into the country. Cf. McMaster, vol. II, p. 395.

<sup>4</sup> *C. P. G.*, p. 85.

<sup>5</sup> De Bow, *Compendium of U. S. Census, 1850*, p. 122.

<sup>6</sup> *C. P. G.*, l. c.

<sup>7</sup> *C. P. G.*, p. 32, tracing the survival of the original 1790 population through the decades of the nineteenth century estimates that twelve per cent

of persons who return to their native land or press on to some other country, reaches, at times, an astonishingly large figure. In fact by their failure to take into account this remigration are to be explained the errors which some writers make when discussing the subject of immigration. Thus, for example, the return movement to Italy, during the years for which we have records, takes away from two-thirds to nine-tenths as many as enter,<sup>8</sup> while the emigration of the British and Irish is also very great, it being greater by 143 than the immigration in the year 1876.<sup>9</sup>

While it is only in recent years that the United States Government statistics furnish definite information on this point, there are unofficial records extant which give reliable testimony on this fact. Thus the records of the Trans-Atlantic Passenger Association for the period 1899-1910 show that during that time 37 steerage passengers were carried from United States ports to European ports for every 100 such passengers brought from Europe to the United States, and similar data from other sources show substantially the same result.<sup>10</sup> While it is quite clear that this movement out of the country did not reach such proportions during the years under discussion (1790-1820) nevertheless, even in these early days, there was such a movement.<sup>11</sup> It may be estimated at the nominal figure of ten per cent of the immigration, the net immigration, accordingly, being seventy-eight per cent of the total after deducting twelve per cent for deaths and ten per cent for departures. The immigration of 245,000 during the period would therefore represent a net increase of 190,000 among the foreign born.

It is not easy to determine what proportion of these were Catholics since data are lacking; in fact it is difficult to estimate how the different nationalities were proportionately represented among these immigrants. Historical events, including some statistical data, give a clue to the solution of the problem, indicating as they do that this immigration was almost exclusively English, Irish and German. Very few French had entered the country for two reasons. The French Revolution was the rising of the proletariat, and consequently few of the common people cared to emigrate. When conditions changed and France was at bay before the assaults of all Europe, her citizens were unable to leave, while at the same time no welcome awaited them in the United States died the first decade. In other words, that of any representative body twelve per cent would die in the first decade is a reasonable supposition. Cf. also *id.* p. 127.

<sup>8</sup> Foerster, *The Italian Immigration of Our Times*, p. 30.

<sup>9</sup> S. C. Johnson, *A History of Emigration from the United Kingdom to North America, 1763-1912, in tables*.

<sup>10</sup> S. R. I., p. 372. Cf. also chapter VI of the present work.

<sup>11</sup> For evidence of seasonal movement of workers between Ireland and Newfoundland in the eighteenth century, cf. Young, *op. cit.*, ed. 1780, vol. I, p. 112, vol. II pp. 177, 184.

because of the friction existing between the two countries.<sup>12</sup> Yet it remains true that the Church here derived a great benefit from the French Revolution through the arrival of many French priests, especially Sulpicians, who had been forced to flee before the storm.

In the early part of the period English immigration was represented chiefly by deserters from English ships in American harbors. English sailors left their ships by the hundreds; in one case the entire crew of a British vessel quit in a body to join an American ship.<sup>13</sup> However, it was not until after the battle of Waterloo that any appreciable number entered the country. In 1815 the usual depression following a declaration of peace, the disbanding of soldiers and sailors, the heavy taxes, caused so much suffering and dissatisfaction among the English that they began to come to this country by thousands despite the untoward conditions here. So strong did this current become that the English made a concerted demand for parliamentary action to stop the "ruinous drain of the most useful part of the population of the United Kingdom." Statistics preserved in American newspapers of the time record that during the week ending the 23d of August, 1816, fifteen hundred natives of Great Britain arrived at five American ports, 800 in the following week and 1,027 in the third week.<sup>14</sup>

During 1817 thirty thousand emigrants were believed to have entered the country, while 15,000 are known to have landed at Philadelphia and New York during 1818.<sup>15</sup> About one-half of these were Irish, who in many instances were so poor and untrained that, unable to obtain work, they became a charge on the community. Even thus early, however, emigrant-aid societies were founded to try to cope with and remedy the evils that beset the newly landed foreigner here.

Not many Germans arrived during these years, the German tide of immigration beginning only about the year 1840.

From the foregoing data, and from a comparison with reliable statistics for the two following decades (1820-30 and 1830-40) it may be estimated that of the 190,000 net immigration about 50,000 were Irish Catholics, out of a total net Irish immigration of perhaps 80,000 or 90,000.<sup>16</sup> This estimate seems doubly justified in

<sup>12</sup> The Alien and Sedition laws and the naturalization laws, it will be remembered, were directed chiefly against French residents here. Cf. McMaster, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 395.

<sup>13</sup> Friction arising from these desertions and British impressment was largely the cause of the War of 1812. Cf., McMaster, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 242.

<sup>14</sup> McMaster, *op. cit.*, vol. IV, p. 389 *seq.*

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 392.

<sup>16</sup> A large number of the Irish immigrants of this period were Presbyterians from the north of Ireland. Cf. Baird, *op. cit.*, esp. Bk. I, ch. 16, pp. 42 *seq.*

view of the fact that in the following decade, out of 151,000 immigrants, 54,000 were Irish, and in the next decade (1830-40) out of 599,000 there were 207,381 Irish. The great Irish flow had not yet started, and to estimate the Irish element in this period as nearly if not quite one half of the total seems more consonant with available data than some statements occasionally found.<sup>17</sup> We may next consider 27,000 as the contribution from other countries—England, Germany, France—to our Catholic ranks, thus arriving at 77,000 as the net increase in the number of Catholics added through immigration during the years in question.

We come now to a discussion of the natural increase among those who were already residents of the country when the census of 1790 was taken; in other words, to what figure should the 35,000 Catholics of 1790 have grown, through natural increase, by the year 1820?

On this point reliable data are made available by Government statistics. The rate of increase among the white (including the growth due to immigration) was 35.7, 36.1 and 34.1 per cent respectively for the decades ending in 1800, 1810 and 1820.<sup>18</sup> Had all the immigrational increase taken place in the last of these three decades (and it seems, from the facts set forth in the preceding pages, that most of it did) the percentage of natural increase among those included in the census of 1790 and among their descendants would have been almost exactly thirty per cent for this third decade. One is justified, therefore, in attributing to the 1790 population a natural increase of thirty-five per cent during the first decade, thirty-six for the second, and thirty-one for the third decade of this period.<sup>19</sup>

Applying these rates to the estimate of 35,000 (the number of Catholics in 1790) computes a natural increase of 12,250 from 1790 to 1800; of 17,000 on the total of 47,000 during the next ten years; and 20,000 on a total of 64,360 during the third decade, the total in 1820, consequently being 84,000.

<sup>17</sup> Byrne, *Irish Emigration to the U. S.*, p. 17, says, "A very large majority of these immigrants during this period were Irish, as is acknowledged by all." Baird and other writers do not acknowledge this.

<sup>18</sup> While some would demand that a computation of Catholic natural increase be made on the basis of Catholic baptisms, marriages and deaths, an attempt at such computation would be absolutely futile, since there simply are no data to work on. Hence we must apply to Catholics the general rate of increase, making allowance for their greater fertility in later years of the century. It must be remembered, however, that this greater fertility when it exists among immigrants is found among non-Catholics as well as among Catholics. Cf. also ch. VI.

<sup>19</sup> The rate is purposely kept high to offset any possible underestimate in immigration, and as a concession to a certain extent to the greater fertility of Catholics, although this is not so true of the pre-Civil War period. In arriving at the rate of natural increase the immigrational increase was, of course, first deducted. Cf. Table XLIIa.

There were also some accretions by acquisition of territory during this period but the Catholic gains through this source have undoubtedly been much overestimated. It is usually stated, on the authority of Archbishop Marechal, that the acquisition of Louisiana Territory and Florida<sup>20</sup> increased the Catholic population of the United States by 75,000. The fact of the matter is that such a large addition did not take place, inasmuch as the white population of Louisiana when the territory was purchased was only 24,000 and that of Florida about 10,000.<sup>21</sup> Even counting the slaves, who do not enter into the present computation, the total population only slightly exceeded Archbishop Marechal's figures, so that according to him the vast majority (in fact almost all) of this population, including the slaves, were Catholics.<sup>22</sup> Actually there were very few Catholics among the slaves, as was true also of the whites.

To consider the white population: of the 10,000 inhabitants of Florida at the time of the purchase, very few could have been Catholics. Though the Spanish had founded the colony, practically the entire Spanish population of 5,700 moved away in 1763 when the territory passed under English rule.<sup>23</sup> The Catholic nucleus and foundation of the colony thus disappeared, and during the twenty years of British occupancy they were replaced chiefly by "loyalists" from the revolutionary colonies, who were for the most part Anglicans and Methodists. These formed a fairly stable element in the population precisely because they were not very welcome elsewhere following the establishment of the Republic. During the second Spanish period (1783-1821) Spanish settlers came in considerable numbers but, as previously, many moved away at the cession,<sup>24</sup> and accordingly, of the 10,000 white population in 1821 not more than 3,000 were Spanish, while 2,000 or 3,000 is a fair estimate of the number of practical Catholics in the territory.

In Louisiana conditions were quite similar. As we have seen, the white population of this territory at the time of the purchase

<sup>20</sup> Although Florida did not become United States property until 1821 when Spain ratified the cession, the purchase is usually considered as of 1819, the year of the negotiations, and hence we may include this transfer in the present period under discussion.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *Compendium of U. S. Census, 1850*, p. 39.

<sup>22</sup> The total population of Louisiana is given as 77,000, of whom 53,000 were slaves, at the time of the purchase. The total population of Florida at its first census (1830—eleven years after the date of the negotiations for its purchase) was 34,000, of whom 16,000 were slaves. The first census of Louisiana gave a total of 76,556 of whom 34,311 were white. Cf. *Compendium of U. S. Census, 1850*, p. 39. Cf. also, *Negro Population in the United States, 1790 to 1915*, (U. S. Gov't publication), p. 45.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. *Cath. Encyc.*, vol. VI, p. 117, art. "Florida."

<sup>24</sup> In 1850 there were only 70 Spanish-born residents in Florida. Cf. *Compendium of U. S. Census, 1850*, p. 118.

(1803) has been estimated at 24,000, evidently a very fair estimate, since the census of 1810 (the first United States census to enumerate the inhabitants of this territory) listed only 34,000 whites.

How many of the 24,000 of 1803 were Catholics? Before attempting an estimate attention must be called once more to the fact that we are discussing Catholicity in the United States; and as the connection of Louisiana with this country dates only from 1803 it is that year that must be taken as the starting point for the inclusion of Louisiana in the present study. Although Louisiana was founded chiefly by Spanish and French (in 1806 there were only 350 English-speaking whites in New Orleans)<sup>25</sup> yet these representatives of Catholic nations did not in 1803 present a vigorous degree of Catholicity. If there were many of this Catholic stock lost to the Church owing to conditions prevailing in the colony when it was under Spanish or French rule, the fact is lamentable, but it cannot in fairness be charged to the American Church. One cannot lose what one never possessed, and the American Church must not be "credited" with a gain of thousands of Catholics, who were such in name only, and then charged consequently with a loss of these thousands who were never really in her fold.

In point of fact, then, it is not correct to classify the 24,000 Louisianians as Catholics in the same proportion as their nationality would at first sight demand. Conditions in the colony had nearly at all times militated sadly against spiritual progress. The question of jurisdiction had been a troublesome one owing to the fact that the territory was under indefinite rule subject to the see of Quebec. The uncertain state of affairs became more complicated in 1763 when the territory became Spanish and received from that country both political and ecclesiastical heads who remained in charge until 1800 when France regained possession, only to cede to the United States three years later. The result of all this was that the Church of Louisiana was in 1803 in a pitiable condition. As early as 1763 may be noted the destruction of some Jesuit churches not by a "bigoted mob of Protestants"<sup>26</sup> but by persons styling themselves Catholics. Schism and insubordination were rampant, outsiders intruded themselves into the government of the Church and spirituality was at a low ebb. Some years after the purchase a Freemason enjoyed the distinction of being president of the Board of Trustees of the Cathedral,<sup>27</sup> while in 1812 the Easter Communions in New Orleans amounted to only two or three hundred. The legitimate harvest of the previous years was being reaped. If therefore 15,000 out of the 24,000 of the 1803

<sup>25</sup> *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. IX, p. 382, art. "Louisiana."

<sup>26</sup> DeCourcy and Shea, *New History of Catholic Church in U. S.*, p. 612.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 615.

stock are classed as Catholics the estimate is admittedly high enough to include all practical Catholics gained to the American Church by the Louisiana purchase.

It is unnecessary to point out that those Americans who had migrated to the new territory previous to 1803 are not to be considered in this computation, since if they are considered as a gain here, they would, on the other hand, be a loss elsewhere. Hence it is apparent that (allowing perhaps 4,000 as the extent of this migration) seventy-five per cent of the new stock are here classed as Catholic. Adding to the 15,000 a natural increase of thirty-three per cent up to the time of the first census in Louisiana (1810) lists in that year about 20,000 Catholics who may be considered to have increased to 27,000 by 1820. Instead of the 75,000 of Archbishop Marechal it is thus apparent that the acquisition of territory brought to the Church an increase of 29,000 during the period. It is true that the white population of Louisiana was 73,383 in 1820 but any Catholics among the difference between 27,000 and this last figure have been computed in the calculation of increase by immigration and natural increase in the United States as a whole for these 46,000 came from one or both of these sources,<sup>28</sup> through migration chiefly, and hence they have already been enumerated.

The accretion by conversions during this period remains to be considered. Naturally no reliable statistics are available, but records of recent decades indicate that at the present time the number of conversions may be roughly estimated as averaging approximately one or one and one-half converts a year for each priest in the country. There is every reason to believe that this is a high figure for the early days of the American Church, on account of the circumstances prevailing—the generally despised condition of Catholics, the poverty of the Church and the consequent lack of appeal to those who might feel called to seek instruction and entrance into the fold. However, in default of any better method we may apply to the early decades the same rate as is found to exist in later years. The number of priests in the United States during this period rose from 34 in 1790 to 150 in 1820, there being 50 in 1800 and 70 in 1810.<sup>29</sup> On these figures a rough estimate of 5,000 converts during this period may be adopted as representing the increase due to this factor.

The foregoing computations give the following result:

The 35,000 Catholics of 1790 had by natural accretion increased to 84,000; immigration had brought 77,000 Catholics into the coun-

<sup>28</sup> The migration of Americans, *e.g.*, during the brief period from 1806 to 1809, amounted to 3,100. Cf. *Cath. Encyc.*, vol. IX, p. 382.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Murray, *A Popular History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, p. 316.

try; there were 29,000 Catholic residents in the territory added to the United States during the period; there were about 5,000 converts. The Catholic population of the United States should have been 195,000 in 1820, and this is the estimate based on the data set forth in the previous pages of this study and here adopted. Much depends on the accuracy of this estimate since it is to be the starting point of the study proper. By 1820 the government of the Church as well as that of the country had become somewhat stabilized, and ecclesiastical conditions warrant us in considering the American Church as having passed through its baptism of fire. In 1808 Baltimore had been raised to the dignity of an Archdiocese, while the dioceses of Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Bardstown had been founded. In addition New Orleans, already a diocese in 1793, constituted a new member in the list through the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. No longer in its infancy, the Church can be held to account if it hereafter fail in its mission. The year 1820, too, as has been previously pointed out marks the initial step of the Government in gathering statistics of immigration—statistics which make it possible with sufficient accuracy to trace the growth of the Church as affected by this most important factor.

Since the truth of the conclusions of this study rests in great measure on the accuracy of the present estimate it may well be asked how this figure compares with the records of the actual Catholic population of the time. Contrasting with this estimate of 195,000 stands that of Archbishop Marechal, who placed the number of Catholics in 1820 at the much higher figure of 244,000.<sup>30</sup> The difference of 49,000 is easily accounted for, however. It will be remembered that Archbishop Marechal estimated the number of Catholics gained by the acquisition of Louisiana and Florida as 75,000. However, as was seen, the entire white population of these two territories at the time of our acquisition of them did not exceed 34,000. If 26,000 are classified as Catholics (a percentage far higher than the true figure) the difference between that figure and the estimate of 75,000 by Marechal explains also the difference in the totals. In view of the facts contained in the statistics adduced, the lower figure here is certainly more nearly correct, and the present estimate is plainly in substantial agreement with the corrected figures of Archbishop Marechal.

The statistics of the present chapter, tabulated, appear in the following table:

<sup>30</sup> Cf. O'Gorman, *History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States*, p. 494. On the other hand, Dr. Matignon of Boston estimated the Catholic population of 1817 at only 140,000. Cf. Adams *View of All Religions*, p. 369. Cf. also the estimate of 100,000 quoted by Bishop England. See p. 184 and 225.

TABLE I, SUMMARY 1790-1820

U. S. White, 1790.....	3,172,006	Cath. pop., 1790.....	35,000
Increase by territory...	34,000	Cath. terr. inc.....	29,000 <sup>31</sup>
Immigration .....	245,000	Cath. imm. inc.....	77,000
Inc. by imm.....	190,000	Cath. nat. inc.....	49,000
Foreign born (aliens), 1820 .....	53,687 <sup>32</sup>	Conversions .....	5,000
U. S. White, 1820.....	7,866,797	Cath. pop., 1820.....	195,000

<sup>31</sup> It would appear that a very large percentage of the population added by territorial acquisition had been classified as Catholic. The reason for the discrepancy is that 29,000 is the figure obtained by adding to the Catholic population of Louisiana in 1803 (15,000) the natural increase between then and 1820 plus the 2,000 in Florida at the time of the acquisition of the latter.

<sup>32</sup> United States Government statistics quoted in this and following tables may be verified by reference to *S. R. I.*

## CHAPTER V

### A GENERAL SURVEY OF AMERICAN IMMIGRATION; ITS SOURCES; ITS CAUSES

With the year 1820 we emerge from the realm of estimates, and plant ourselves on the solid ground of official statistics, and it is accordingly with this year, as has been previously indicated, that this study of Catholic growth in the United States properly begins. From the year 1820 on, in accordance with a law enacted in 1819,<sup>1</sup> statistics of immigrants entering the United States from foreign countries are available. The basis of classification is by country of last permanent residence (which, it is plain, may not be the same as that from which the immigrants sail), and hence for the great majority of the immigrants the classification indicates also the race to which they respectively belong, this latter point being the determining factor making it possible to ascertain their religious affiliations, and hence to discover what was the influx of Catholics during the period. However, although the general classification remained the same throughout the century, minor changes have occurred. From 1820 to 1867 the data are for "alien passengers arriving"; from 1868 to 1903 for "immigrants arriving"; from 1904 to 1906 for "aliens admitted"; and since 1906 for "immigrant aliens admitted."<sup>2</sup> The differences noted have some effect on the resultant figures since the two classifications from 1820 to 1867 and from 1904 to 1906 do not admit of distinction between those who would enter the country merely on a visit and the true immigrants who would come to make a permanent or quasi-permanent home here. However, since the number of visitors is slight compared with the total, the difference may be disregarded, especially as the addition thus made to the number of immigrants will tend to offset the number of the latter who enter the country, chiefly from Mexico and Canada, without being enumerated by United States officials. It is stated above that the basis of classification is the country of last permanent residence of the immigrant. This point leads to some slight difficulties since it happens that natives of a certain country reside at times in another country before coming to the United States, the danger being that they will thus be erroneously listed as natives of the country from which they

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *S. R. I.*, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.

last sailed instead of their own country. For statistics previous to 1850 this difficulty holds, but it does not cause any great amount of error. After 1850 any error due to this can be avoided since from that year statistics are available on the number of foreign born, by nationality, in this country at the end of each decade, thus making it possible to determine the net increase by immigration, according to nationality, with a greater degree of accuracy.

In making use of official statistics of immigration in connection with the present study, an estimate of the number of Catholic immigrants from a country in each decade is arrived at by applying to the total immigration from a given country the percentage of Catholics in that country. First, the net total immigration, in the case of the three decades from 1820 to 1850, for which there are no precise figures on emigration from America, is determined by deducting for each decade fifteen per cent from the total immigration, to allow for returns, departures to other countries, and for deaths. Of this amount, five per cent may be considered as the deduction for deaths and ten per cent for returns and departures. As for the former deduction it must be considered as a very conservative one, since the number of deaths in a normal population over a period of ten years amounts to about twelve or thirteen per cent of the total original population at the beginning of the decade.<sup>3</sup> The decadal immigration, however, from which the deduction is made is not in the country for ten years, since the arrival of the immigrants is distributed among all the years of the decade. If the arrivals were distributed equally over all the years of the decade (in most cases this is practically true) the average length of residence of the total immigration of a given decade would at the end of the period be five years. In other words if a million immigrants should enter the United States in ten years at exactly the equal rate of 100,000 each year it would be correct to say that the entire million had been here five years, so far as the computation of deaths in America among these immigrants is concerned. The number of deaths for the decade would therefore

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *C. P. G.*, p. 127, where 400,000, or over thirteen per cent is the estimate of deaths in a population of 3,000,000, in a decade. In the case of Ireland, which has furnished so much of our immigration, a far higher proportion of deaths is found. From 1871 to 1880 the number of deaths was 18.7 per cent of the total population; from 1881 to 1890 it was 18.9 per cent; in the next decade it was 21.3 per cent for nine years (statistics for 1898 are missing) or probably above 23 per cent for the decade; from 1901 to 1910 (statistics for 1904 missing) it was 18.6 per cent for nine years, or well over 20 per cent for the entire decade. Cf. Table III, this work. In England the death rate for the year 1862 (to pick out at random a typical year) was 2.1 per cent—over 20 per cent for ten years, at the same rate—and the rate was fairly constant in adjoining years. Cf. *Statesman's Year-Book*, 1878, p. 243. Cf. Tables I.XVIII, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XLI.

be one-half the number for a normal body of persons present throughout the entire ten years. To adopt five per cent, then, instead of six or seven per cent as the death rate is already a conservative measure. But it must be remembered that if anything, the death rate will be higher than in a normal population, for although there is a majority of persons in the prime of life among the immigrants there is also, especially in the thirty years from 1820 to 1850, a large number of people weakened by disease and hardships, as the figures for Ireland prove.<sup>4</sup>

It is well to forestall here any objection that might be made to the effect that these deaths are accounted for in the general population statistics, in the sense that they are a partial factor entering into the computation of the ordinary natural increase which, as is evident, is simply the excess of births over deaths. The answer to such an objection lies in the fact that the immigrants who die during the decade in which they enter the country are counted only as a gain (by being enumerated in the following census, under the heading of immigration) whereas they are really equivalent to emigrants, who, though having once entered the country, now constitute a population loss by their departure. On the other hand one cannot claim that these immigrant deaths<sup>5</sup> should be balanced by the births in the same decade among their families, for the latter are native born and are included in the general computation of natural increase for the country.

The second factor in the fifteen per cent deduction is that of emigration from the United States. A more extensive exposition of this subject will be undertaken in the following chapter. It will suffice here to quote just a few examples in order to show that a ten per cent allowance for the effect of this factor is a very conservative estimate indeed. During the years for which statistics are available (unfortunately they do not exist for any nationality before 1870) the rate averages over thirty-seven per cent for all nationalities,<sup>6</sup> and rises to as high as sixty-four, seventy-two, and even eighty-three per cent of the immigration for certain nationalities.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Cf. preceding footnote.

<sup>5</sup> Reference in this connection always is to deaths among immigrants during the fiscal decade in which they enter the country; that is to say, after they have been enumerated as immigrants (which is done the moment they enter the country) and before they are enumerated in the general population (which is done only at the census next following their arrival).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *S. R. I.*, p. 372. Cf. also Table VII, this work.

<sup>7</sup> Italian emigration from the United States amounted to 42.97 per cent of the immigration in the period 1892-96, to 30.93 per cent in the years 1897-1901, to 37.9 per cent from 1902 to 1906, to 72.6 per cent from 1907 to 1911 and 64.9 from 1912 to 1915. Cf. Foerster, *op. cit.*, p. 30. "The number of emigrants who return to Italy from the United States, either permanently or temporarily, is very large. According to Italian statistics 2,231,961

These phenomenal instances, however, someone may object, have reference only to the later—the so-called “new”—immigration from southern and eastern Europe. It will surprise such objectors to learn that the statement holds also—and even to a greater degree—for that class which is usually considered as the most stable of all, the natives of the British Isles. Emigration of persons of these nationalities, when compared with the immigration of the same nationalities into the country, constituted during the period from 1876 to 1880, 56.3 per cent of the latter; from 1881 to 1890 it was 37.4 per cent; from 1891 to 1900, 83.9 per cent and from 1901 to 1910 it was 72.9 per cent.<sup>8</sup>

From the data cited it is hardly necessary to claim any further justification for the nominal ten per cent deduction, for while it is true that in the earlier decades the return movement was somewhat smaller than in the later decades, yet it could hardly at any time have been below ten per cent of the immigration.<sup>9</sup>

After the net immigration for a decade has been thus computed, the net *Catholic* immigration is determined by applying to the net amounts for each country the proportion of Catholics in that country, the presumption being, except where proof shows otherwise, as it does seem to sometimes, that the proportion of Catholics among the emigrants from a country will be approximately the same as among the inhabitants of that country.

The justification of such a presumption as the above is found in a study of the causes of European<sup>10</sup> emigration. These causes may be reduced to three: religious oppression, political reasons and economic necessity or utility. Of the three the predominant one in the nineteenth century is the last named, because the two former act purely only on the leaders and usually touch the mass of the people only in the form of the economic results of the religious or political policy of their Government.

Italian third-class passengers, practically all of whom were emigrants, departed from Italy for the United States in the years 1887 to 1907, inclusive, and during the same period 972,695 of the same class returned from the United States to Italian ports. In other words, 436 passengers of this class returned to Italy for every 1,000 sailing for the United States.” Cf. *E. C. E.*, p. 228.

<sup>8</sup> Data taken from official British statistics. Cf. Table IX, this work.

<sup>9</sup> As indicated above, the system of deducting fifteen per cent for deaths and returns applies to the decades from 1820 to 1850. After 1850 statistics are available on the number of foreign born by nationality in the United States at the end of each decade, and for the decades during which there are no emigration statistics another system (set forth in chapter IX) is worked out, dependent on the foreign-born statistics, for determining the net immigrational gain.

<sup>10</sup> European is specified because the vast majority (92.3 per cent) of all immigrants to the United States come from Europe. (Cf. *E. C. E.*, p. 5.) Moreover whatever the causes of other than European immigration there are found only a negligible number of Catholics among them, with a few exceptions which will be duly noted.

Religious oppression, as such, had ceased by the year 1820 to be a moving factor in the migration of citizens of the countries which furnished the bulk of the immigration into the United States. Excepting Russia, which presents a special Jewish problem, only in Great Britain and Ireland were there vestiges remaining and here this factor operated rather through its economic results than directly in itself. In other words, emigrants from Ireland usually contained almost the same proportion of Protestants as did the entire population of the island, because the ill treatment of the Emerald Isle on the part of England, though its bases are rooted deep in religious bias, was composed in the nineteenth century chiefly of iniquitous customs laws and repression of industrial development, and the result was that the Protestant peasantry suffered almost in as great measure as did the mass of Catholics. I say *almost* because it is true that until 1869,<sup>11</sup> when the "Irish Church" was disestablished, a great wrong was done the Catholics in forcing them to support the Protestant Church established in the land. As early as 1829, however, a start had been made in alleviating conditions, by the passage of the Emancipation Act which applied to Catholics in Ireland, England and Scotland, admitting them to all public offices, with few exceptions, and giving them a vote in all elections.

The political background of Anglo-Irish relations in the nineteenth century leads to the same conclusion. As has been observed above, the factors under discussion are so intertwined that none is entirely separable from the others. The Emancipation Act and the Disestablishment have been touched upon from the religious point of view, although they had political ramifications both in cause and result. The more purely political questions (always remembering their religious origin) agitating the Irish people in the nineteenth century were the agrarian problem and that of self-government (Home Rule). The land problem was the result of the plantation system whereby Irish landowners had been dispossessed by foreign intruders planted by the English. Thus the Irish people, as a mass, had become tenants on the very land of which they had been despoiled.<sup>12</sup> Coupled with gouging high rents was the custom of raising the rents still higher if any improvements were undertaken by the tenants. This intolerable condition led inevitably to reprisals, the "agrarian crimes," in which landlords, in property and person, were often attacked by the infuriated and oppressed peasantry. The "Young Ireland" party in

<sup>11</sup> A partial relief had been granted in 1838 when the payment of tithes was shifted from the peasants to the landlords. This was a very dubious concession since the tax was, as is usual in such arrangements, ultimately paid by the oppressed tenants.

<sup>12</sup> The Irish Land Acts of 1870 and 1903 relieved somewhat the burden of injustice under which the majority of the Irish peasantry were groaning.

the insurrection year of 1848 sought to rouse the nation to a concerted revolt but failed as signally as did the Fenians in the late sixties. As for the Home Rule problem, as a result chiefly of the agrarian uprisings the English Government often promised relief but never actually fulfilled its promises during the nineteenth century.

To point to the conclusion of the foregoing remarks, to draw attention to the truth of the proposition that in all its troubles Ireland's inhabitants, irrespective of religious affiliation, were almost equally interested and affected, it is sufficient merely to mention the fact, without detracting at all from the undying fame of Daniel O'Connell, the great Liberator, that the outstanding leaders of the Irish people in the nineteenth century, after he had passed from the scene, were Isaac Butt and Charles Parnell, both Protestants, as had been Henry Grattan, the Parliamentarian, and Robert Emmett, the national hero of the Irish race before him.

In discussing the economic causes of Irish emigration it suffices to add a brief explanation of what has already been said of this phase of the subject. The potato blight of 1821, and the terrible famine of 1845-47 are the two chief features. Terrible as was the famine and widespread as were its results, it is probable, however, that its *immediate* effect on emigration has been considerably exaggerated. In the decade ending in 1830, 50,000 Irish had come to the United States; in the following decade, 207,000; and in the next, the famine decade, 780,000 came. Evidently the rate had been increasing rapidly even previous to the famine and in all probability as many as 400,000 would have emigrated anyway, so that it is probably correct to attribute an emigration of between 300,000 to 400,000 directly to the famine.<sup>13</sup>

However, there has, since 1847, undoubtedly always been a fairly direct relation between the potato crop in Ireland and emigration from that country. Estimating the potato crop in thousands of tons, the average annual yield between 1847 and 1890 was 3,352.8. In 1861 it was 1,814.4; in 1862, 2,137.8; in 1879 it was 1,095.9; in 1882, 2,011.2; and in 1887 it was 2,640. In each case the following year witnessed an abnormal emigration. In contrast to this fact the yield was especially good in 1853, 1855, 1858, 1864, 1870, 1876, and 1883; and of these seven years, every one was followed by a season of contracted emigration to the United States.<sup>14</sup>

Strangely too, the factor of over-population operates as a determining factor in Irish emigration. When the famine of 1847

<sup>13</sup> Indirectly, however, through the poverty and hardships of the ensuing years the famine caused many more to emigrate.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. S. C. Johnson, *A History of Emigration from the United Kingdom to North America; 1763-1912*, p. 52.

made its appearance the population, being then somewhat over eight millions, had reached a point of unusual density for Ireland —251 per square mile. The overcrowding was, however, only relative, as can be seen from the statistics for England where the population per square mile was 273 in 1841, 308 in 1851, and by 1901 had risen to 558.<sup>15</sup>

The crowded conditions were local and were due to the iniquitous land system referred to above. In 1838 congestion was felt in Armagh, Monaghan, Cavan, Fermanagh, Antrim, Down, Tipperary, Cork and Waterford and a great exodus of emigrants was the result.<sup>16</sup> The congestion was as stated, only relative, however, for there was plenty of land to support a much greater population had it not been for the unspeakable injustice exercised by those in power toward their helpless victims. Mention has been made of the despoliation of the petty landowners in Ireland. At first the despoiled victims were given the poor privilege of leasing again their own land. However, toward the middle of the century the movement looking to consolidation of farm lands into big holdings began to exert greater and greater pressure on the leaseholders, and numerous small farmers were evicted from their holdings. When a lease for a small plot expired, the farmer was cast out and no opportunity was given him to renew it even at a higher rental. So widespread became the evil that in 1843 the Government made a show of investigating it by appointing a Commission, to no purpose, it seems, since later, in the short period from 1849 to 1856 no less than fifty thousand men were turned adrift from their farm plots to satisfy the overlords' lust for consolidation into great tracts of park and hunting grounds. These poor dispossessed farmers, left without a means of livelihood, drifted to the villages and urban centers, where, as a consequence, the congestion became so great that the only relief was to emigrate.<sup>17</sup>

Other phases of the economic factor, common to both the "new" and the "old" immigration will be taken up when discussing the subject at greater length in treating of the Italian, Austrian and Russian immigration.

Of England and Scotland (although not so important for our purposes, because of the small number of Catholics) much the same, from the economic point of view, can be said as of Ireland. In England overcrowded conditions arose at times owing to the machinery of the poor-law. Until an enactment of 1832 it was the practice of the authorities to eke out the wages of the laborers with money derived from the poor-rates. It was, therefore, to the advantage of the overlords that their estates should be cleared of

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *Statesman's Year-Book*, 1905, pp. 16 and 23.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

<sup>17</sup> Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

all people likely to seek relief. As a consequence, thousands of tenants were ejected from their homes and their houses razed to the ground. Those who were cast adrift gradually found their way into the neighboring "open villages," and it was in these settlements that the congestion took place. The type of man who suffered most under this inequitable system of levelling up wages with public funds was the small farmer whose land and residence came within the jurisdiction of one of these overcrowded "open villages." Though perhaps he employed no labor, and so gained nothing from the hire of men whose services were partly paid for by the local authorities, yet he was called upon to contribute lavishly towards the poor-rates, which were unduly high owing to the presence, in his district, of crowds of underpaid laborers who had been ejected from neighboring parishes. At the best of times, the income of such a farmer was seldom sufficient for his frugal needs, but when he became tortured with an ever-increasing rate, life grew impossible and emigration helped to solve his troubles.<sup>18</sup>

The consolidation of farms, too, in order the more profitably to supply, by large farms, the greater amount of corn and wheat demanded by the rapidly growing population, the amendment of the poor laws, and the introduction of farm machinery, also helped emigration by making the lot of the farm hand harder and harder.

In Scotland, on the other hand, the suffering was chiefly caused by the general practice of subdividing crofts on the marriage of the crofters' children so that the land was soon composed of divisions too small to support a family.<sup>19</sup>

Like the Irish, the German immigration throughout the century has been a great factor in the growth of this country, but, unlike the former, the German immigration was due not so much to the iniquitous rule of an oppressor as to natural conditions which brought about a widespread movement out of Germany. Until 1871, the year of the formation of the German Empire, Germany was composed of a large number of independent small states and principalities, hampering each other by conflicting customs laws and similar enactments, each jealous of its neighbor, and all jealous of Prussia which they looked upon as desirous of annexing them into a greater Prussia. Despite the general existence of compulsory military service, which tended to make emigration difficult, German immigration to this country during the century from 1820 to 1920 has been greater than that from any other European nation, it having contributed 5,495,691, or over a million more than did Ireland which sent the next largest number. In the decades previous to the establishment of the empire about two and one-half million Germans entered the United States, but of these only about

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*, p. 41.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*, p. 42.

100,000 were from Prussia<sup>20</sup> where the military service laws were the strictest. The result of this was undoubtedly to decrease the percentage of Catholics among the German immigration previous to 1871, for while the percentage in Prussia is about thirty-five per cent, it exceeds that figure in only two other states (Bavaria and Baden) and averages hardly as much as fifteen per cent in the Protestant states which sent a majority of the immigration from Germany to this country.<sup>21</sup>

After the formation of the empire the German immigration dropped a little (it was 718,182 from 1870 to 1880) then rose to the enormous total of 1,452,970 in the decade from 1880 to 1890 to recede with a sudden subsidence to 543,922 in the following decade, to 341,498 in the next, and to 143,945 in the final decade (that of the Great War). Apart from the revolutionary troubles of 1848, consequent upon which many radicals came to America,<sup>22</sup> the causes of the peculiar fluctuations in the German immigration are to be found in the conditions of the country. Reference has already been made to conditions previous to 1871. After that year, although unified, the state was unable to provide sufficient remunerative labor to take care of its rapidly growing population. With the beginning of the twentieth century these conditions no longer obtained, and when Germany became at the same time a leading commercial nation and began establishing colonies in Africa and Asia, emigration from that nation to the United States practically ceased.

After the year 1880 the character of immigration from Europe

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Art. "Emigration," vol. VIII, ed. 1893, p. 175. The proportion from Prussia in later years was greater. Cf. Table LXIX.

<sup>21</sup> The Catholic percentage for all Germany averaged about 30 or 32 per cent previous to 1871. (Alsace-Lorraine with its large number of Catholics did not then belong to Germany.) For further details on this point and for distribution of German immigration since 1870 according to German states cf. Table LXIX.

<sup>22</sup> In discussing the causes of the German exodus during the 50's, Friedrich Kapp, for many years a commissioner of emigration, says, in his work on "Immigration," "The coup d'état of Louis Napoleon closed for all Europe the revolutionary era opened in 1848. In the three years preceding that event, the issue of the struggle of the people against political oppression had remained doubtful. But the second of December, 1851, having decided the success of the oppressors for a long time to come, the majority of those who felt dissatisfied with the reactionary régime left their homes. The fact that the largest number of Germans ever landed in one year in the United States came in 1854, showed the complete darkening of the political horizon at that time. The apprehension of a new continental war, which actually broke out a year later in the Crimea, also hastened the steps of those who sought refuge in this country." Quoted in *The American Cyclopædia*, vol. VI, ed. 1874, p. 579, art. "Emigration." The article referred to was written prior to 1874. As a matter of fact, however, as complete statistics show today, in only one year (1882) between 1820 and 1920 did German immigration exceed that of 1854.

into America was marked by a sudden and violent change. Previous to that year over ninety-five per cent of our immigrants had come from England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland. Since then about seventy-five per cent has come from Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, Greece, Italy, Montenegro, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Russia, Servia, Spain and Turkey. Austria-Hungary, Italy and Russia sent the great majority.

The recent agitation for restriction of immigration and the laws passed are due chiefly to this change, it being claimed that the "new" immigration, coming from southern and eastern Europe, is not so desirable or permanent as the "old." While the present study is not directly concerned with the quality of our immigrants, it is interesting, in passing, to note how sharply contradictory of the above opinion are the words of a British author on emigration in describing the character of our immigrants from England.

Until Canada and the United States took precautions to safeguard themselves against the coming of our human derelicts, it was the practice of parishes, societies, and countless charitably disposed persons to ship across the Atlantic the men and women who could not succeed at home.<sup>23</sup> Year by year the ne'er-do-wells were sifted from our population and provided with the money to reach North America. Those who could not find employment at home or who were unfit to work were sent off in thousands, without any thought as to their ultimate fate. It was no uncommon happening for magistrates to suggest emigration as an alternative for imprisonment, whilst even today (1914) barristers sometimes intimate that, if their clients are discharged, an undertaking will be given that they will be sent to America. . . . One can almost imagine the disgust with which our American cousins welcomed such. . . . Looking at the practice, however, from a British point of view, it must be admitted that this selective process which tended for over fifty years to rid us of our degenerate population, though diplomatically indefensible, could only help to raise the general standard of those who remained behind.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>23</sup> "Emigration is considered a riddance of diseased population," *Edinburgh Review*, vol. 92, p. 493 (Footnote Johnson's).

<sup>24</sup> Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 298. The same idea is expressed in even stronger language by an American consul in Italy, who, in comparing the Italian arrivals here, with those of English nationality, speaks as follows: "In fact about the worst emigrants we get in America, physically, morally and intellectually, are those classed as English. . . . The immigrant we get, known as the English, is the product of the slums—a Jew, a Syrian, the element from Whitechapel and Liverpool, the dregs of the great city." Cf. *E. C. E.*, p. 181.

The author quoted is undoubtedly guilty of a rather sweeping generalization which must be qualified somewhat upon a study of the complexity of causes which lead to emigration from England as from other countries.<sup>25</sup> His words are, however, illuminating and his candor commendable.

On the other hand, the opinion of an American consul in Italy may be cited in regard to the character of such a typical representative of the "new" immigration as the Italian. According to him the Italian emigrant represents "the cream of those who have enterprise enough to exercise initiative. In fact, one of the complaints of the present day of the Italian officials is that the very best young blood of the Italian plebes is going out of the country."<sup>26</sup>

With the permanence of the respective classes of immigration we are directly concerned. Here an examination of data, in a comparison of the two typical nationalities already mentioned, reveals facts sharply contrasting with the general belief in regard to the subject. It is generally believed, and correctly, that Italian immigration to this country is not permanent. It is not so generally known that British immigration is at least equally impermanent if not even more so. The explanation of this fact is to be found in the ease with which the Englishman can adjust himself to conditions in this country, helped as he is by the unity of languages. To cite again the British author quoted above:

Thousands of our skilled mechanics, stone-cutters, stone-masons, glass-blowers, locomotive engineers, etc., regularly visit the New England states in the spring. They do not go as contract men, for such is forbidden, but they depend on their skill and ability as passports for speedily finding them work. They earn good wages all through the season, most of which is remitted to their wives in England. When the slack period arrives they pack their grip sacks and go back home, only to return to the United States at the commencement of the following spring.<sup>27</sup> In this way, they escape American taxation, perform none of the duties of citizenship, and they spend the bulk of their money outside the country in which they earn it.<sup>28</sup>

How extensive and long continued are the conditions depicted in this passage is apparent from statistics reproduced here in comparison with those on Italian emigration.

<sup>25</sup> The very fact that so many British are free to return to England (cf. Table Ia) is somewhat of an indication that their departure from England was voluntary on their part.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>27</sup> "Immigration Troubles," *Nineteenth Century*, Oct., 1891, p. 588.

<sup>28</sup> Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 318.

TABLE Ia

*Comparison of Return Movement of British and Irish with Return Movement of Italians, from the United States.<sup>29</sup>*

	British and Irish emigration equals = per cent of im- migration of same.	Italian emigration equals = per cent of Italian immi- gration.
1876-1880.....	56.3	
1881-1890.....	37.4	10. (1887-90)
1891-1900.....	83.9	34.
1901-1910.....	72.9	57.
1911-1920.....	68.4	82.

When the analysis is carried further the comparison is even more to the disadvantage of the British (as distinct from the Irish who are coupled with them in the table). In these statistics the exact proportion of Irish cannot be ascertained, but when one remembers the circumstances of emigration from Ireland, and the continued declining population in Ireland, it is incontrovertible that a large percentage of the movement out of that country did not return. Hence it can be seen that the percentage of returns among the British was even higher than set forth above, and it is proper to conclude that purely British immigration into this country has been for many years a temporary movement, and, in addition, a movement of persons whom the United States could well have dispensed with.

To consider now conditions more in detail in connection with the three countries mentioned more specifically as contributing so greatly to the new immigration.<sup>30</sup> The political history of the formation of Italy is quite similar to that of Germany, and in this fact undoubtedly is to be found the reason why Italian immigration did not become very noticeable until after 1870, the year of unification. Contrary to what happened in Germany, however, after unification many problems presented themselves in Italy which continued to find their solution only in emigration, and therein lies the reason why, while German immigration to America subsided with the beginning of the twentieth century, that from Italy rose by leaps and bounds.

Although the territory comprising Italy has been a part of the civilized world since the dawn of history, politically the Italy of today is among the newer nations of the world. Prior to 1859 what are now the compartments of Piedmont, Liguria, and Sardinia formed a part of the Kingdom of Sardinia; Venetia and Lombardy were provinces of Austria; Tuscany was a grand

<sup>29</sup> For source cf. Tables VIII and IX.

<sup>30</sup> For reference on the following pages cf. *E. C. E., passim*.

duchy; Marches, Perugia (Umbria), Roma (Latium), and the Provinces of Bologna, Ferrara, Fordi, and Ravenna, in Emilia, were a part of the Papal States, while the Kingdom of Naples (including Abruzzi, Campania, Apulia Basilicata, and Calabria), with Sicily, formed the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. By the peace of Zurich in 1859, Victor Emmanuel, King of Sardinia, obtained Lombardy, and in the following year it was annexed to his Kingdom. Although the peace of Zurich provided for the organization of Italy into a confederation with the Pope as honorary president, these provisions were not carried out; instead, Sardinia annexed Tuscany in the very same year, together with a part of the Papal States. In 1861, partly as a result of the campaigns of Garibaldi's "Thousand" and at the expense of the Papal States, Victor Emmanuel of Sardinia was proclaimed King of Italy. In 1866 Venetia was acquired from Austria and in 1870 the occupation of Rome and the despoliation of the remainder of the states of the Church completed the unification of Italy.

Italy is one of the most densely populated countries of Europe, continuing so despite the amount of emigration, because of the high birth rate. Moreover, although there is no general relation between overpopulation and emigration in the case of most European countries, the case is different with Italy because the resources of the country are not sufficient, or at least not at the present time sufficiently developed, to afford means for the adequate support of the large and growing population, and emigration is simply a natural consequence.<sup>31</sup>

On the other hand, however, the very poverty and lack of capital among the peasantry, coupled with the intensive love of country which nearly every Italian feels for his native land, explains why so many Italians return to Italy after having sojourned for a while in a foreign land. The savings of his exile enable him to establish himself in comfort among his more genial native surroundings, as a small capitalist and landowner, and his example, in turn, sends his friends abroad to seek their fortune too.

The flow of immigration to this country from Austria-Hungary did not reach the 1,000 mark until 1869 when 1,499 were admitted. In 1880 it first reached the 10,000 mark, 17,267 entering, and from that year on it grew apace until the number of immigrants in the year 1907 alone (338,452) exceeded the total immigration to the United States from Austria-Hungary from 1820 to 1887 inclusive, the number for that period being 298,304. While the cause of the Austro-Hungarian immigration to this country is essentially the same as that from Italy—chiefly the absence of industrial develop-

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Francesco S. Nitti (economist and member of the Italian parliament), *The Wealth of Italy*, trans. from the Italian by E. C. Longobardi (Rome, 1907). Quoted in *E. C. E.*, p. 152.

ment and the growth of a population which the land could not support—the reason why this cause did not operate earlier is to be found, in great part, in the history of the land-tenure system of the country.

Until about the middle of the nineteenth century the legal ownership of all the land in Austria and Hungary was vested in the lords, from whom the peasants held them in fief. In return for this tenure the peasant owed to the lord certain payments, part of which were made in labor and part in produce. In 1848 this system was abolished, and the peasants became the legal owners of their holdings, being enabled to do so by loans from the state which they were obliged to pay back gradually. Under the feudal system the peasants had not been allowed to subdivide their holdings nor was any general permission given them to do this even after they became the owners of the land, until 1869. In all of the districts, with the exception of the German Alpine territory, the peasants began in 1869 to divide their land among their children with the result that the peasantry became more and more impoverished since individual holdings were too small (as the population increased) to enable them to make an adequate living. Thus, for example, Lika Krbva, the source of large emigration from Croatia, had in 1900 a population of 208,000 and only 225,780 acres of arable land. The consequence was that, since agriculture was the mainstay of the people, there being very little industrial development, relief was sought in emigration. It is hard to see how they could have done otherwise.

Russian emigration was due partly to religious and partly to economic causes.

During the nineteenth century thousands of Jews were forced to leave Russia chiefly through economic pressure, although at times, direct killing and pillaging of the victims was resorted to openly. The economic situation in Russia, however, which led to the emigration of Jews, was general. Consequently a large number of other Russian citizens, also emigrated, although the proportion of real Russians among the immigration to the United States was for most decades rather small, since the Russian people is a heterogeneous one.

In the century from 1820 to 1920 there entered this country from Russia 3,281,005 persons, most of whom have immigrated since 1890. In the year 1820 only 14 immigrants from the Russian Empire were admitted to the United States. Less than 200 were admitted in any fiscal year until 1846, when 248 were recorded. Not until 1866 was this number equalled again, and it was not until 1872 that the number reached 1,000. From that time on there was a steady increase, over a million and a half coming in the decade from 1900 to 1910, while in the next decade, which saw

the Great War, nearly one million more succeeded in making their way to this country.

Economically Russia presents features quite similar to those found in Austria-Hungary. Until some years after the middle of the nineteenth century serfdom was the condition obtaining among the Russian peasantry. However, after the Crimean War economic and political reasons led to a change. Many of the landowners felt that serfdom did not pay, and the Government, because of the widespread discontent among the masses, deemed it wise to emancipate the peasants from above, and thereby win their loyalty, rather than wait until their discontent would lead them to emancipate themselves from below. Accordingly in 1861 serfdom was abolished and a system similar to that in Austria-Hungary was established. However, since the details of the change were left in the hands of representatives of the landholding classes, and since these deemed it to their advantage to give to the peasants as little land as possible, or preferably no land at all, that thus a land-poor and landless peasantry might in their clamor for employment reduce the wages of the agricultural workers, the result was that the freedmen had, by about one fifth, less land to cultivate after emancipation than during serfdom. Coupled with this fact was the necessity many peasants were under to make annual payments on their land for forty-nine years, together with other expenses, so that the general result of emancipation was that a considerable proportion of the peasants were in a worse economic condition than they had been while serfdom prevailed. Such conditions, aggravated as they were by primitive methods of cultivation, led to a great exodus to Siberia, fostered by the Government. This exodus finally turned also to America, practically with the connivance, but not the permission, of the Russian Government.

However, apart from the agrarian problem, Russian immigration presents a special feature because of the presence in the country of a large number of Jews who have always been more or less obnoxious to the Government. During the fiscal years 1899-1910, 43.8 per cent of the immigrants admitted to the United States from Russia were of the Hebrew race. The explanation is found in the treatment of the Jews by the Russian Government. Restricted in habitation (to the "Pale"), in occupation (forbidden to engage in agricultural pursuits), and in educational facilities, and practically isolated from self-governing bodies, terrorized by pogroms and persecutions, and called upon for more than their share of military service, the Jews made their way out of Russia as best they could, despite the laws forbidding emigration, and came in large numbers to the United States.

From Russia came also many Poles (separately enumerated in the statistics of this work and thus really lowering the Catholic

percentage among Russians). Many Finns, Germans, and Swedes with a fair percentage of real Russians also emigrated. The result is undoubtedly to leave the percentage of Catholics among those classed as Russian immigrants appreciably lower than the percentage among the total population of Russia (about eight per cent) although the latter is adopted and applied in the immigration tables of this work.

The foregoing pages treat briefly of the primary causes of emigration based on conditions in the various European countries to which special treatment was given because of the large number of persons coming from them to the United States. There were in addition many contributory causes, operating practically at all times and among all the countries of Europe, and without which the primary causes never would have produced such remarkable results.

Chief of these contributory causes is the advice and assistance of relatives or friends who have previously emigrated. Letters from those who have emigrated, to friends and others at home, it is estimated by the United States Immigration Commission, have been the immediate cause of by far the greater part of the remarkable movement from southern and eastern Europe to the United States in the last thirty-five years, while the same is undoubtedly true of the immigration from Germany and Ireland. Reports of high wages and prosperity travel from person to person throughout whole villages, thus determining many to emigrate who otherwise, howsoever much they may have desired to, would not have had the courage to tear themselves away from their native haunts. Similarly, returned emigrants, by the reports of the success that they met with and by the concrete evidence of their prosperity, caused many others to emulate them.

In like manner, in some instances there are mutual savings societies whereby through drawing of lots a member is enabled to emigrate, and he, repaying the amount advanced, enables another member to follow him in a short time. In addition to this, it is a fact that nearly all immigrants enter this country to join friends or relatives who had preceded them. Thus, for example, 94.7 per cent of all the immigrants entering in the fiscal years 1908 and 1909 were going to join relatives or friends already in the United States.<sup>32</sup>

While labor contracts were in the past a contributing cause, the same is not true to any extent at present, because of stringent laws against contract labor, but assistance of friends here is very often the only way in which the poor peasants of Europe could ever hope to reach the United States. This is evidently chiefly true of families whose wage earners had preceded them. Exactly what propor-

<sup>32</sup> Cf. *E. C. E.*, p. 59.

tion of the present immigration is assisted in this way cannot be determined, but some indication is contained in the probable fact that about twenty-five per cent of the immigrants admitted to the United States come on steamship tickets paid for in this country. In the calendar year 1907, 27.6 per cent of the steerage passengers embarking at Naples for the United States were provided with prepaid tickets, and this is considered as in all probability a fair average for all European ports.<sup>33</sup>

Another cause is the activity of steamship ticket agents in Europe. Their influence is considered by the United States Immigration Commission as undoubtedly the most important immediate cause of emigration from Europe to the United States, and this propaganda flourishes in every emigrant-furnishing country of Europe, notwithstanding that the promotion of emigration is forbidden by the laws of many such countries as well as by the United States immigration law. It is unnecessary to go into details here in regard to the terrible injustice practised on the prospective emigrants by these agents and by others often in league with them, emigrant runners, boarding-house keepers and other human vultures who prey upon their ignorant and gullible countrymen, the latter being doubly fortunate if, having escaped this danger in Europe, they are successful in running the gauntlet after their arrival in this country.

Having outlined briefly the general causes operating in Europe to produce the large immigration into this country during the last century we must not overlook the fact that there were also events operating here which from time to time caused the immigration to fluctuate greatly, now to an unprecedented crest and now to a low mark. Chief among such events may be mentioned the business depressions in 1837, 1857, 1873, in the eighties, in 1893 and 1907, the Civil War and the World War, all of which decreased immigration considerably; while on the other hand the periods of prosperity marked especially by the building of the Erie Canal and the trans-continental railroads, and the discovery of gold in California, Nevada and the Yukon brought a sudden rush of immigrants. Tariff conditions in this country had, too, at times a remarkable influence on immigration. For example, the United States tariff law of 1890 is said to have destroyed the pearl-button industry in Bohemia, the chief industrial district of Austria-Hungary, thereby throwing many out of work and giving impetus to the emigration movement.<sup>34</sup>

Before passing to a consideration of the Catholic percentage in the countries from which American immigration has been drawn in the century under discussion, it is necessary to treat of two fac-

<sup>33</sup> *E. C. E.*, *loc. cit.*

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *E. C. E.*, p. 369.

tors which have operated to lower the net gain in population in the United States through immigration. These two factors are first the predominance of males among the immigrants, and secondly, a point which has been briefly touched upon already, the large return emigration from this country.

## CHAPTER VI

### GROSS IMMIGRATION AND NET POPULATION GAIN

Many writers, in discussing the subject of Catholic growth, or rather what they term the lack of it, in the United States, come to their adverse conclusions because they fall into two errors. They assume, because it is a fact that the fecundity of foreign-born females is greater than that of the native-born in this country,<sup>1</sup> that therefore a greater rate of natural increase should apply to the whole body of the foreign-born population and their descendants, without inquiring whether the proportion of married persons among immigrants and those of immigrational stock would warrant such a procedure. The writers referred to assume also that an immigrant never emigrates. In paving the way for a statistical study of Catholic growth through the decades of the past century it is the purpose of this chapter to expose the errors mentioned, in order that by arriving at a true judgment in regard to immigrational<sup>2</sup> increase in general it may be possible to make a just computation of the Catholic increase in this country due to this factor.

In order that the same birth rate as is found in their own country should apply to the foreign-born population in this country it is self-evident that the proportion between the sexes should be the same for them here as in Europe or at least approximately so, for the birth rate naturally depends on the number of families and not on the gross number of people. Nature pretty generally provides almost an equality in the number of persons of each sex. In Europe, according to censuses taken just previous to 1910, in most of the countries there was a preponderance of females, the number

<sup>1</sup> Foreign-born mothers at the present time have 25 per cent more children each than the native-born, according to a recent census report covering for the year 1919 the birth-registration area of the United States which is now composed of 27 states and the District of Columbia. ("Average number of children ever born: Per native white mother, 3.2; per foreign white mother, 4.0.") The mortality among children of foreign-born mothers is greater, however, and the excess of children surviving to each foreign-born mother is only 21 per cent. ("Average number of surviving children: Per native white mother, 2.8; per foreign white mother, 3.4"). Cf. Rossiter, W. S., *Increase of Population in the United States 1910-1920*, p. 153.

<sup>2</sup> The word "immigrational" is here used in a general sense to include both immigrants and descendants of immigrants.

of males to 100 females being 93.7 in England and Wales, 96.7 in France, 97.4 in Germany, 97 in Switzerland, 96.5 in Austria, 99.1 in Hungary and 98.9 in Russia.<sup>3</sup> This preponderance of females was undoubtedly due in some measure to the preponderance of males among those who had emigrated from those countries. In the United States, among the native white population, the number of males to 100 females in the decades from 1850 to 1920 has ranged between 103 and 102.<sup>4</sup> The foreign-born population, however, presents a striking difference, for there has always been among immigrants a much larger proportion of males than females. The number of males to 100 females in the foreign-born population in this country was 123.8 in 1850, 115.1 in 1860, 115.3 in 1870, 115.9 in 1880, 118.7 in 1890, 117.4 in 1900, 129.2 in 1910 and 124.3 in 1920.<sup>5</sup>

The disproportion is due to the fact that many more male than female immigrants enter the country. Thus during the period 1820-1840, sixty-eight per cent of the immigrants were males and from 1820 to 1867, approximately 59.6 per cent of the immigrants were males. From 1869 to 1910 the percentage of males was 64.9. Of every 1,000 immigrants in 1910, 707 were males and 293 were females, or 2.4 times as many males as females. During each of the eleven years ending in 1910 twice as many males as females arrived in the United States, except in 1908, when the proportion of males was slightly lower. In 1907 the proportion of males was 724 per 1000 immigrants.<sup>6</sup> In the decade ending in 1920 the same high proportion is found, the males numbering sixty-four per cent of the entire immigration.<sup>7</sup>

This feature is especially true of the immigration which has furnished the bulk of Catholic immigrational increase since 1869, as the following table, giving statistics for all immigrant-furnishing countries having a greater Catholic percentage than thirty per cent, shows. According to these statistics, Ireland is the only nation to send an equal number of both sexes during the period from 1869 to 1910. Whether the proportion of the sexes among the Irish immigrants was as nearly equal in the years previous to 1869 it is impossible to say, as statistics of immigrants by sex were compiled only for the gross number entering the country, and not by nationality, for that period. It is rather to be doubted, however, as previous to 1869 the southern and eastern European immigration was negligible, the Irish and German constituting a large part of the total, and yet the percentage of males among the immigrants entering the country between 1820 and 1830 was 72.8 per

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *A. T. C.*, p. 97.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, and Fourteenth Census, *Population*, 1920, p. 8.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *S. R. I.*, p. 7.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *S. A. U. S.*, p. 92.

cent, in the next decade 65.5 per cent, in the following one 59.2 per cent, in the next 58 per cent, and in the period from 1860 to 1867 it was 59.8 per cent.<sup>8</sup> At any rate, the fact that numerically the proportions of the sexes in the Irish immigration was normal in the years for which statistics are available is offset, so far as Catholic immigration goes, by the abnormal conditions among the other nationalities, the bearing of which will be pointed out shortly.

TABLE II

*Immigration from Countries over 30 per cent Catholic, by Sex, 1869 to 1910.<sup>9</sup>*

	Total	Male	Female	Per Cent M.	Per Cent F.
Austria-Hungary ....	2,978,644	2,059,899	918,745	69.2	30.8
Belgium ....	82,932	54,817	28,115	66.1	33.9
France ....	223,684	139,301	84,383	62.3	37.7
Germany ....	3,084,675	1,787,658	1,297,017	57.9	42.1
Ireland ....	1,765,830	882,761	883,069	49.93	50.07
Italy ....	2,837,250	2,218,929	618,321	78.2	21.8
Mexico ....	57,985	40,699	17,286	70.2	29.8
Poland ....	142,798	95,321	47,477	66.9	33.1
Portugal ....	118,403	73,164	45,239	61.8	38.2
Spain ....	46,120	36,288	9,832	78.7	21.3
Switzerland ....	171,893	110,639	61,254	64.4	35.6
Total ....	11,510,214	7,499,476	4,010,738	65.2	34.8

The consequence of this disproportion of the sexes is to lower the net number of births by lowering the number of marriages, for although intermarriage with the native population (chiefly with natives of foreign parentage) is practised to some extent, the most natural course is that the foreign born seek matrimonial partners among their own people. Many of the men therefore find it impossible to marry, and the higher birth rate among those who do marry is as a consequence neutralized.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *S. R. I.*, p. 6.

<sup>9</sup> This table is compiled from data in *S. R. I.*, pp. 30 to 44. Statistics by sex are missing for all countries for the years 1893-1895 (inc.), and 1899. The statistics for Poland cover only the period from 1869 to 1898. Statistics for Mexico are also not complete.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. on this point J. D. B. DeBow, *Statistical View of the United States, a Compendium of the Seventh Census* (1850), p. 121: "This matter of increase of foreigners by birth, is worth a little further examination. The production or natural increase must be in ratio of the number of the females of the productive age, and not to the whole number of the people. Foreigners generally intermarry with each other, so far as we have means of observation; there are comparatively few instances of natives and aliens uniting together, so few are these that they do not militate against the general rule. With all it will be safe to say that there are no more marriages of foreigners than there are foreign marriageable females, the exceptions are so rare as not to destroy any extensive calculation made in regard to it."

Furthermore, another angle of this question is seen in the fact that many of the surplus males among the immigrants are already married but separated from their wives, the latter having been left in the old country while the bread winners seek their fortune here. Thus in the population of the United States, 15 years of age and over, in 1910, there were 407,913 more married men than married women, a condition chiefly explained by the presence here of those who had left their families behind when emigrating from Europe.<sup>11</sup> In 1920 the excess of married men was 530,333.<sup>12</sup>

It must be justly concluded from the foregoing that when the general birth rate of the United States is applied in computing the natural increase among the immigrant stock the resultant figure must at least equal the true growth among them. In the early decades of the century when the birth rate among the native population was much higher, this course would tend to compute an even greater increase among the foreign stock than actually took place.<sup>13</sup> In fact, this is very probably true of the later decades.

A conservative view of this question is presented in the following words of a Government statistician:

Although the birth rate for immigrant families is high, the infant-mortality rate is also high. Moreover, the proportion of married persons among immigrants, not including men who have left their wives in their home countries, is relatively low. It is possible, therefore, that the rate of natural increase among immigrants, especially during the first few years after arrival in this country, may correspond rather closely to that for the total population. At any rate, this assumption appears as tenable as any other, and it has accordingly been made.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> *A. T. C.*, p. 146.

<sup>12</sup> *A. F. C.*, p. 216.

<sup>13</sup> The decadal rate of increase during the early part of the century was much greater than it is now. Thus in the decade ending in 1800 it was 35.1 per cent, in that ending in 1810 it was 36.4 per cent, in the next 33.1 per cent, and in the succeeding decade 33.5 per cent. In the decade ending in 1840 it was 32.7 per cent and rose to 35.9 per cent and 35.6 per cent in the two following decades. In the earlier decades immigration had not risen to a high figure yet the birth rate for the country was high. Cf. *A. T. C.*, p. 22. Cf. Table XLIIa.

<sup>14</sup> Rossiter, *op. cit.*, p. 151. The proportion of married persons is somewhat larger among the foreign born than among the native white of native parentage, but this difference is practically offset by the large number of married men whose wives have been left in Europe. Moreover this greater proportion is due to the higher average age of immigrants, a fact which tends to lower their fecundity. Cf. Ogburn, W. F., Factors Affecting the Marital Condition of the Population, in Publications of the American Sociological Society, vol. XVIII, 1923, p. 47.

The preceding quotation refers only to immigrants. An examination of statistics for the descendants of immigrants discloses the fact that the net rate of natural increase among them must be comparatively low, in view of the smaller percentage of married persons among them than among the purely native stock, even granting that they have a greater fecundity than has the native stock, a proposition which is by no means certain.

In 1920, of the population 15 years of age or over, among the native white of native parentage, 58.9 per cent of the males and 60.4 per cent of the females were married; among the native white of foreign or mixed<sup>15</sup> parentage, 50.8 per cent of the males and 54.0 per cent of the females were married. In 1910 for the same age class, among the native white of native parentage, 56.3 per cent of the males and 59.4 per cent of the females were married, while among the native white of foreign or mixed parentage, 46.3 per cent of the males and 51.1 per cent of the females were married. In 1900 the difference was greater, the percentages being 55.0 and 57.7 for males and females respectively of the former class, and 42.7 and 49.4 respectively among the latter. Again, in 1890 the divergency was still more marked, the percentages being 55.4 and 58.2 for the former and only 36.2 and 44.3 for the latter.<sup>16</sup> In other words, for the years covered by extant statistics, the descendants of immigrants in this country show decidedly less inclination to marry than do the natives of native stock. The per cent of excess of married persons among the latter was for males and females respectively, 8.1 and 6.4 in 1920; 10.0 and 8.3 in 1910; 12.3 and 8.3 in 1900 and 19.2 and 13.9 in 1890. Whatever is to be said of the fecundity of the respective classes, it is plain that the rate of natural increase among the descendants of immigrants is considerably lowered because of their comparatively low marriage rate.

Summing up this question of immigrational increase, it seems clear that any advantage due to the greater fecundity of the individual foreign-born female is neutralized completely by the higher infant mortality among the children of foreign born, by the preponderance of males and the presence of so many married men living apart from their wives among our immigrants and by the low marriage rate among the children of immigrants.<sup>17</sup>

To the objection that might be urged against not raising the rate for the Irish immigrants, since, as was noted above, there was not a preponderance of males among them, at least since 1869, it

<sup>15</sup> One parent foreign, the other native.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *A. F. C.*, pp. 216, 217. Statistics on these points do not extend back beyond 1890.

<sup>17</sup> For a general discussion of the birth rate in foreign countries and in the United States, as distinct from the questions treated here, cf. Tables XXXVII, XXXVIII, and XLI and accompanying text.

must be answered that nevertheless a far greater allowance and addition to the rate of natural increase among the Irish is made by the mere application of the normal American rate. Reference has already been made<sup>18</sup> to the high mortality rate among the Irish. The effect of this mortality rate is more concretely apparent from an examination of the ratio of births and deaths among the Irish in Ireland.<sup>19</sup> As will be seen from the following table the death rate in Ireland is pitifully high—so excessive, in fact, that it keeps the natural increase down to a minimum, to an average of sixty-three hundredths of one per cent ( $63/100$  of 1 per cent) per year (6.3 per cent per decade) for the entire period from 1871 to 1909, while the American rate was usually several times as large (twenty-four per cent, 1871-80; twenty-one per cent, 81-90; twenty per cent, 1891-1900; fifteen per cent, 1900-1910). At the same time, the number of births is not large—due in some measure to the emigration of so many in the prime of life, but also due greatly to the impoverished and weakened condition of the race.

TABLE III

*Rate of natural Increase in Ireland, 1871-1909.<sup>20</sup>*

Period	Pop. End of Decade	Births	Deaths.	Net Births	Annual Rate of Inc.
1871-80	5,174,836	1,402,570	967,575	434,995	.84
1881-90	4,704,750	1,150,783	883,762	267,021	.57
1891-1900 <sup>21</sup>	4,458,775	949,563	748,215	201,348	.48
1900-10 <sup>22</sup>	4,390,219	817,578	612,718	204,860	.60

Total for 37 years: average of .63 per cent per year.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. p. 33.

<sup>19</sup> The natural-increase rate is even lower among the Irish in this country. Cf. Jas. J. Walsh, M.D., "Irish Mortality in New York and Pennsylvania," in *Studies*, vol. X, Dec., 1921, p. 628: "The death rate of the Irish here is higher than that of the Irish at home." "At ages 25 to 64 the death rate in Pennsylvania and New York State of those born in Ireland is over two and one-half times that of the native population," p. 629. Cf. also this work, p. 129.

<sup>20</sup> Although the population of Ireland did not actually increase at all during this period, yet by taking the population as it was at the end of each decade (thus avoiding the effect of the great emigration) we can see what was the real ratio of the excess of births over deaths to the whole population. The resultant ratio in this case is really too high, because it should be figured not on the population at the end of the decade but on the average population for the decade.

<sup>21</sup> Statistics for 1898 missing.

<sup>22</sup> Statistics for 1904 missing. Table III is compiled from data available in the *Statesman's Year-Book*, annual, various years. Cf. this work, Tables XXXVII, XXXVIII, XLI.

We come now to the second question mentioned at the beginning of this chapter—that of emigration. As has already been intimated more than once in the course of the present study, this is a point which has been strangely overlooked by many writers. This fact is sufficient justification for devoting a few pages to it here rather than merely to take into account the number of emigrants when computing the decadal tables in the course of the work. Unfortunately there are no complete statistics in regard to the emigration from the United States during the century under discussion. After 1907, however, the Government kept a detailed record of aliens leaving United States ports and while this does not include all foreigners departing from this country (for, naturally, some naturalized citizens and a few native citizens also leave with the intention of not returning), yet it affords an approximate gauge of the movement during the years for which the statistics are available. As will be seen the emigration is a steady, continuous movement although, as is to be expected, it rises during periods of business depression in this country just as immigration increases during periods of unusual industrial activity. Thus, while the fiscal year 1906-7, an unusually prosperous season, was marked by the largest immigration in the history of the country, in the following year, 1907-8, the beginning of the industrial depression in October caused a sudden reversal in the tide, and there was a great exodus of European aliens. In 1906-7 nearly a million and a quarter persons had entered the country, and in the following year nearly 400,000 (over thirty per cent of the phenomenal immigration of the record year) departed. The contrast is even more impressive when it is noted that while 956,019 entered in 1906-7 from southern and eastern Europe, among whom consequently there was a greater percentage of Catholics than among those from the other sections of Europe, 347,044, or over thirty-six per cent of them, who were predominantly Catholics also, left the country in 1907-8. Even more striking are the figures for the years 1918, 1919 and 1920—the reconstruction period after the war. In these three years 78.2 per cent of the immigration emigrated.<sup>23</sup>

To turn from the abnormal conditions of a record immigration year and periods of business depression, we may examine the

<sup>23</sup> The statistics for these three years are as follows:

	Immigration	Emigration	Excess Immigration
1918 .....	211,853	193,268	18,585
1919 .....	237,021	216,231	20,790
1920 .....	621,576	428,062	193,514
Total .....	1,070,450	837,561	232,889

Cf. *S. A. U. S.*, p. 103.

records for the period from 1908 to 1920. From these available data it will be apparent that during this period at least one-third of all European immigrants who come to the United States eventually return to Europe. Moreover, this outward movement is not to any appreciable extent composed of persons who follow seasonal occupations in the United States and who consequently come and go according to the seasonal demands for labor, as many seem to think. Naturally if this were a seasonal movement, if, in other words, a great percentage of the immigrants were persons who had previously been in the United States and who were, therefore, conversant with American customs and methods, the task of the Church in assimilating them and caring for them would be much lighter. As a matter of fact, of the immigrants who entered this country in the period from 1899 to 1910 only twelve per cent had been here previously.<sup>24</sup>

A further noteworthy point which has a decided bearing in its relation to the growth of the Church in America is the fact, just as is true of the immigration, that there is a striking predominance of males in the movement from the United States to Europe. For example, during the fiscal years 1908-1910, 82.7 per cent of all departing aliens and 85.4 per cent of the southern and eastern Europeans were males. In addition, 86.6 per cent of all departing aliens were from 14 to 44 years of age,<sup>25</sup> indicating that the outward movement is largely composed of persons in the prime of life. The effect on the net natural increase among the immigrational stock in this country is self-evident.

The cause of the large outward movement and especially that part of it (about eighty-eight per cent) which leaves the United States permanently, is largely a matter of conjecture. That it is not due to lack of opportunity for employment, except in a period of depression, is evident from the fact that there is a steady influx of European laborers who have little or no difficulty in finding employment here. It seems reasonable to suppose that the movement is due to various causes, including dissatisfaction with conditions here, ill health, the desire to rejoin family and friends, the fulfillment of an ambition to possess a sufficient amount of money to make life at home less of a struggle, and the necessity of obeying the military service laws. One thing is evident from the large number of those in the prime of life who return to their native land: the movement is not an exodus of those who, nearing the grave, hasten back to be buried with their fathers. That explanation is too simple to be true.

Data for returning emigrants, compared with the statistics on immigration for the period 1908-1920, for certain nationalities

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *E. C. E.*, p. 51.

<sup>25</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 45.

which contain a high proportion of Catholics, appear in the following tables.

TABLE IV

*Immigration and Emigration for certain Nationalities, compared, 1908-1910.*

	Immigration	Emigration	Per Cent
Austria-Hungary . . .	597,437	206,034	34.5
France . . . . .	22,843	9,949	43.5
Germany . . . . .	89,132	17,891	20.0
Ireland . . . . .	93,089	6,972	7.5
Italy . . . . .	527,258	302,356	57.3
Poland . . . . .	274,018	82,901	30.3

This table is compiled from data in *S. R. I.*, pp. 43, 44, and 372.

It is interesting to note that in these three years the number of emigrants exceeded that of immigrants into the United States in the case of those of Belgian nationality: Immigration, 13,256; emigration 22,150.

TABLE V<sup>28</sup>

*Immigration and Emigration for certain Nationalities, compared, 1911-1920*

	Immigration to U.S.	Emigration from U.S.	Emigration is — Per Cent of Immigration
Austria-Hungary . . . .	896,342	370,418	41.3
France . . . . .	61,897	73,997	119.5
Germany . . . . .	143,945	51,938	36.1
Ireland . . . . .	145,937	32,728	22.4
Italy . . . . .	1,109,524	911,753	82.

Although previous to 1907 no official record of the outward movement of aliens was kept by the United States Government, there are available the records of steamship companies and of foreign countries which give similar results for earlier years. From these sources it is known that for a considerable period of years the emigration of aliens has been approximately one third as great as the immigration movement to this country. The records of the Trans-Atlantic Passenger Association for the years 1899 to 1909 (inc.) show that the movement has been a general one for some time. These records show that for every 100 steerage passengers arriving here during the period referred to, 37 left the country.

<sup>28</sup> Table V is compiled from United States data (Abstract of U. S., annual, 1911 to 1920) with the exception of emigration from the United States to Italy from 1911 to 1915 (inc.) for which official Italian statistics are used. Complete statistics for all countries for the period 1901 to 1920 will be found in tables XXXIII and XXXV, under the decadal treatment of the question.

## IMMIGRATION AND NET POPULATION GAIN 101

TABLE VI

*Movement of third-class Passengers between United States and European Ports, during Period 1899-1909, by Years.*

Year	All Ports		Per Cent Excess West-bound <sup>27</sup>
	West-bound	East-bound	
1899 .....	380,592	117,469	52.8
1900 .....	502,925	155,537	52.8
1901 .....	544,940	140,993	58.9
1902 .....	752,895	176,958	61.9
1903 .....	887,373	251,912	55.8
1904 .....	762,895	371,149	34.5
1905 .....	1,003,925	243,439	61.0
1906 .....	1,223,081	338,076	56.7
1907 .....	1,378,050	555,178	42.6
1908 .....	419,550	657,179	22.1 <sup>28</sup>
1909 .....	749,666	286,691	44.7

The following table presents the same data in a somewhat different form.

TABLE VII

*Movement of third-class Passengers between United States and European Ports, during Period 1899-1909.<sup>29</sup>*

Ports	West-bound	East-bound	Number leaving U. S. for every 100 arriving
British ports.....	2,604,972	1,012,739	39
No. continental ports.	4,155,732	1,159,237	28
Mediterranean ports..	2,044,605	1,122,605	55
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total .....	8,805,354	3,294,581	37

The foregoing data are further substantiated by official Italian statistics, which show that from 1887 to 1907, 2,231,961 Italians departed in the steerage from ports of that country for United States ports, while during the same period 972,695 returned in the steerage from the United States. In other words, 436 passengers of this class returned to Italy for every 1,000 sailing for the United States. Statistics for this period taken from official Italian sources brought down to 1915 and completed to 1920 from United States sources appear in the following table:

<sup>27</sup> Per cents were figured on the following basis: West plus East equals divisor; West minus East equals dividend.

<sup>28</sup> Eastbound traffic (emigration from United States) in excess.

<sup>29</sup> The fact that nearly all immigrants travel in the steerage, and that relatively few besides immigrants do so, makes it practicable to apply the above statistics to the problem of immigration and emigration. Tables VI and VII are compiled from data in *E. C. E.*, p. 43.

TABLE VIII<sup>30</sup>*Movement of Italians to and from United States, 1887-1920.*

	Immigration to U. S.	Emigration from U. S.	Number leaving U. S. for every 100 arriving
1887-90 .....	176,490	16,687	10
1891-1900 .....	655,694	220,828	34
1901-10 .....	2,045,877	1,154,322	57
1911-20 .....	1,109,524	911,753	82

As indicated in Table VII the movement of emigrants from the United States to British ports has also been consistently appreciable. Table Ia also gave a hint of the magnitude of this movement which is so generally unsuspected on the part of the "uninitiated." The following table sets forth in greater detail the full extent of this movement. The table discloses the fact that during the entire period from 1876 to 1920 for every 1,000 persons of British and Irish origin entering the United States, 594 persons of the same nationalities left our shores—a much greater proportion than that of the Italians during the period for which statistics are available (436 of the latter leaving, for every 1,000 arriving). There is also a large movement of persons of other nationalities who leave this country for the British Isles. The second section of Table IX shows the unprecedented heights which this movement reaches—for every 100 arriving between 1891 and 1900, 151 left the country; in the following decade, for every 100 arriving 170 left the country, and in the two years 1911 and 1912 almost 200 left the country for every 100 entering, while for the whole period from 1876 to 1912, for every 100 arriving from, 89 left the country for the British Isles.

TABLE IX<sup>31</sup>*Returns of British and Irish (and Others) from United States to Great Britain and Ireland, 1870-1920.*

## I. Returns of British and Irish from U. S. 1876-1920.

	Immigration to U. S.	Emigration from U. S.	is — Per Cent of Immigration
1876-80 .....	319,942	180,181	56.3
1881-90 .....	1,462,839	545,437	37.4
1891-1900 ...	745,829	625,553	83.9
1901-10 .....	865,015	621,052	72.9
1911-20 .....	487,589	333,633	68.4
1876-1920 ...	3,881,214	2,305,856	59.4

<sup>30</sup> Table VIII is compiled from scattered data taken from *S. R. I.*, pp. 36-7; *S. A. U. S.*, 1917 and 1920, s.v.; *E. C. E.*, p. 229; Foerster, *op. cit.*, p. 30. The emigration statistics are official Italian statistics to 1915 (inc.). Emigration data from 1916 to 1920, and immigration data for the whole period are official American statistics.

<sup>31</sup> Immigration statistics are United States official (cf. *S. R. I.*) Emigra-

## II. Returns of British, Irish and Others, U. S. to British Isles, 1870-1912.

1870-80 <sup>32</sup> ...	984,914	604,821	61.3
1881-90 ..... 1,462,839		838,322	57.3
1891-1900 ... 745,829		1,123,947	150.7
1901-10 ..... 865,015		1,469,945	169.9
1911-12 ..... 185,523		362,058	195.1
<hr/>		<hr/>	<hr/>
1870-1912 ... 4,944,120		4,399,093	89.

Before completing the treatment of the subject of emigration from the United States two further points must be noted. It was remarked <sup>33</sup> that the classification of immigrants varies in the official Government statistics. The records from 1820 to 1867 are for "alien passengers arriving" and from 1904 to 1906 for "aliens admitted." These classifications consequently include as immigrants those aliens who come here on a visit without any intention of staying (as distinct from those who intend to work here for a while and then depart from the country). The number of such has been estimated as one and two-thirds per cent of the gross immigration.<sup>34</sup>

The second point referred to above is the fact that many aliens are debarred at United States ports for various reasons, although they are nevertheless included in the returns of immigrants. In 1875 the first law against undesirables, providing for the debarment of criminals and women imported for immoral purposes, was passed. The law was very laxly enforced, especially at Atlantic ports, and in 1882 a stricter enactment was put in force prohibiting the entrance of convicts, lunatics, idiots and persons unable to care for themselves without becoming public charges. The enforcement of this law was entrusted to the various states and its operation was not very successful. The first contract-labor law was passed in 1885 and under its terms aliens under contract to labor in this country were added to the class of excluded immigrants. Finally in 1891 a more comprehensive immigration law was passed providing for the direct control of immigration by the Federal Government. Since 1891 various other laws have been passed restricting immigration more and more, thus more effectually debarring those who are not considered as desirable residents.<sup>35</sup> In conse-

tion statistics from 1913 to 1920 are U. S. official (cf. *S. A. U. S.*, annual); all other emigration statistics are derived from statistical tables relating to emigration and immigration from and into the United Kingdom, issued by Parliament, generally annually, with summary of all years. Cf. esp. 1903 to 1912. Cf. also Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 347.

<sup>32</sup> Ten years. Statistics for 1872 missing.

<sup>33</sup> P. 74.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. American Encyc. *loc. cit.*, p. 596.

<sup>35</sup> Reference is to debarment at United States ports, and not to the "quota law" which is supposed to restrict before the would-be immigrant takes

quence of these laws a surprisingly large number of immigrants (who were, however, included in the gross immigration) were debarred (or deported). The number thus excluded during the years from 1892 to 1910 was as follows:

TABLE X<sup>26</sup>  
*Aliens debarred at United States Ports, 1892-1910.*

		Per Cent of Immigration <sup>27</sup>
1892	2,164	.483
1893	1,053	....
1894	1,389	....
1895	2,419	1.004
1896	2,799	....
1897	1,617	....
1898	3,030	....
1899	3,798	....
1900	4,246	1.025
1901	3,516	....
1902	4,974	....
1903	8,769	....
1904	7,994	....
1905	11,874	1.239
1906	12,432	....
1907	13,064	....
1908	10,902	....
1909	10,411	....
1910	24,270	2.3

Enough evidence has been adduced in the preceding pages to show the widespread, and in some quarters unsuspected, extent of emigration from this country. That it affects the Church here, as well as the country, is apparent, for while it decreases materially the net gain of the Church, both absolutely and from the point of view of natural increase, it also presents to the ecclesiastical authorities a great problem in properly caring for those who are here only for a few years, since the latter naturally do not so familiarize themselves with American ecclesiastical customs and institutions, nor so sympathize with and understand them, as do those who have definitely made up their mind to establish a permanent home here. The extent of this problem can be somewhat estimated from a consideration of the shortness of residence in the United States of most of the emigrants. Thus of the emigrants who left this country in 1908, over 94.5 per cent had not been here over five years. In 1909 the percentage was seventy-one and ship, and under which, accordingly, those debarred are not first classed as immigrants.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. *S. R. I.*, p. 367, and *Cath. Encyc.*, vol. X, p. 297, art. "Migration."

<sup>27</sup> Percentage is given for typical years.

in 1910 sixty-seven, while during the whole three-year period the proportion of emigrants who had not been here over ten years was 95.3 per cent.

Statistics on the length of residence in the United States of emigrants during the period 1908-1910 are as follows for certain nationalities.

TABLE XI <sup>28</sup>

*Length of Residence in United States of emigrant Aliens departed 1908-1910, for certain Nationalities.*

		Continuous Residence in U. S.				
	Total	Not over 5 yrs.	5-10 yrs.	10-15 yrs.	15-20 yrs.	Over 20 yrs.
Croatians & Slovenians.	44,736	36,585	7,285	310	157	78
French .....	9,954	6,581	1,903	361	340	345
German .....	41,262	29,146	5,402	699	653	644
Irish .....	6,972	3,936	1,306	298	212	261
Italian .....	308,977	250,163	47,623	3,769	1,941	861
Lithuanian .....	7,190	5,942	1,070	104	57	17
Polish .....	82,901	70,977	9,536	808	438	131
Portuguese .....	2,620	1,889	562	60	51	57
Slovak .....	41,726	34,681	5,858	478	273	117
Spanish .....	6,134	5,001	697	254	41	39
Total .....	552,112	444,901	81,242	7,141	4,163	2,550

Total not over ten years: 526,143. Per cent not over ten years 95.3 per cent.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. *S. R. I.*, pp. 379-382. The sum of the totals of the continuous-residence columns does not balance with the grand total, due to the fact that during the period there were 12,115 emigrants whose length of residence was not ascertained.

## CHAPTER VII

### THE PERCENTAGE OF CATHOLICS AMONG IMMIGRANTS TO THE UNITED STATES<sup>1</sup>

Before the decadal statistics of Catholic immigration can be introduced, a word of further explanation is necessary as to the basis upon which ultimately rests the determination of these statistics. It is quite clear from the facts set forth in the fifth chapter that, with hardly an exception, the proportion of Catholics among the emigrants from a foreign country is approximately the same as this proportion among the general population of the country. Accordingly, in order to be able to compute the amount of Catholic immigration, it is necessary to know the Catholic percentage in the countries which furnish it.

To consider first the Catholic countries: a percentage of between ninety-seven and ninety-eight per cent of Catholics is generally listed in the population of Italy, Portugal, Spain and Mexico. In the decadal tables of this work, however, the percentage for each of these countries is placed at ninety per cent. That the anti-clerical attitude towards the Church, so marked in the countries named, is confined to the two or three per cent of listed non-Catholics in the population is not held by any authority, and it therefore seems justifiable to adopt the figure mentioned as the Catholic percentage. This is undoubtedly sufficiently high to include all Catholics who deserve the name.<sup>2</sup>

In classing France as ninety per cent Catholic also, the same procedure has not been followed. Rather has an addition been made to the real figure as a compromise on a disputed question, about which, however, there can be today but little doubt. France, as the countries above-named, is usually listed as from ninety-five to ninety-eight per cent Catholic. The reason for this is

<sup>1</sup> The statistics quoted in the present chapter are taken from such varied sources that it is impracticable to give the individual references, for these data are not found gathered into a table in any one source. Unless otherwise indicated they are derived, or worked out from data derived, from *The Statesman's Year-Book* for various years, and *Mulhall's Dictionary of Statistics*. In addition to these, some statistics were taken from various other yearbooks and encyclopedias.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. footnote, p. 107.

that in the censuses (which enumerate the religious affiliations of the inhabitants) those who would not declare their religion—the so-called non-professants—among whom were included naturally a large number who really had no religion at all, were always classed as Catholics. In the census of 1881, however, these non-professants (there were seven and one-half millions of them) were listed separately, and the percentage of Catholics consequently fell from ninety-seven to seventy-eight per cent.<sup>3</sup> That there has been all through the century about the same proportion of non-professants cannot be doubted by anyone who would, for example, seek the only plausible explanation of the depopulation of France. Practising Catholics cannot present the phenomenon of a steadily decreasing population without any great emigration to explain it. A recent investigation by a native of France strikingly corroborates the validity of this conclusion. His statement is that in a total population of about 35,000,000 there are today ten millions of practising Catholics in France; that there are sixteen or seventeen millions who may be called partial Catholics; while there are seven or eight millions of non-Catholics.<sup>4</sup> He thus allows twenty-eight per cent as the number of real Catholics, while his computation when it includes even the nominal Catholics amounts to only eighty per cent. Correctly the percentage seems to be not above the latter figure, but as stated above, ninety per cent is adopted as a compromise between the two extremes.

Austria-Hungary which statistics list as seventy-three per cent Catholic before 1850 and sixty-seven per cent Catholic after that date, Belgium which is listed as ninety-five per cent through the century, and Poland which is classed as seventy-five per cent Catholic receive these percentages without deduction in the decadal

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *The Statesman's Year-Book*, 1886, p. 66.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Georges d'Avenel, "L'Église Française après quinze ans de séparation," in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, XCI année, Aug. 15, 1921, p. 820 and Sept. 1, p. 137. "Et 7 à 8 millions seulement, parmi lesquels un petit groupe nettement hostile, vivent sans souci d'aucun culte et, bien que baptisés, ne sont chrétiens que de nom" (Sept. 1, p. 147). A brief reference to this article is to be found in *America*, vol. XXVI, Nov. 5, 1921, p. 51; also Jan. 14, 1922, p. 311, where Vicomte d'Avenel's figures are interpreted as indicating a "return" to the Church, a revival, Denis Gwynn (*Blackfriars*, vol. II, Dec., 1921) having stated that in 1850 there were in France only 2,000,000 Catholics out of a total population of 32,000,000. Further corroboration of this view is found in an article ("Les progrès du catholicisme"), in *Revue Pratique d'Apologetique*, vol. VI, 1908, p. 748, which claims a low percentage of Catholics in France, Italy and Spain. "S'il fallait se borner, dit M. Thureau-Dangin [Revue hebdomadaire, 9 Mai, 1908], dans chacune des trois grandes nations catholiques d'Europe aux catholiques réels, a ceux, par exemple, qui remplissent le devoir pascal, est-on assuré qu'on en trouverait 13 millions?" Cf. also Denis Gwynn, "Is France Catholic?" in the *Catholic World*, vol. CXVII, April, 1923, p. 1. On the other hand, Vicomte d'Avenel's conclusions are attacked in *l'Action*; cf. "Un Mauvais Plaidoyer," in the *Catholic Historical Review*, N.S. I, Jan. 1922, p. 560.

lists, the reasons being varied and not being at all equivalent to denying the presence among their inhabitants of any fallen-away Catholics.

The chief reason for not lowering the rate in the case of these countries is to offset any possible undue diminution in the rate assigned to the other countries. As a matter of fact the proportion of Catholics among the immigrants from Austria-Hungary must actually have been considerably lower than sixty-seven per cent since the heaviest movement came from Hungary,<sup>5</sup> which is only fifty-one per cent Catholic, and not from Austria, which is about seventy-three per cent Catholic.<sup>6</sup> Hence if any objection should be made against lowering the rate in the case of the aforementioned countries, it can easily be seen that applying the high rate of sixty-seven per cent to Austria-Hungary, which furnished during the century over 4,000,000 immigrants to the United States, surely neutralizes any possible error. In the same way the rate for Belgium (ninety-five per cent) and that for Poland (seventy-five per cent) have been left untouched.

Ireland, the last Catholic country to be treated here, presents the unique spectacle of a continuous decline of the Catholic percentage among her inhabitants practically during the whole century. This percentage was at the end of each decade as follows:

TABLE XII<sup>7</sup>

*Catholic Percentage in Irish Population at End of Decades, 1820-1920.*

1830	1840	1850	1860	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910	1920
82.	82.	80.	77.6	76.6	76.5	75.4	74.2	73.8	73.8

Hence, since it is possible that a greater percentage of Catholics is found among Irish emigrants than among the entire Irish population, the proportion in the decadal tables will remain as set forth in the above table, without any deduction. Thus a certain margin is allowed to cover the greater proportion of Catholics, if there

<sup>5</sup> Cf. e.g. *The Statesman's Year-Book*, 1911, p. 615.

<sup>6</sup> An idea of the religious complexion of the immigration from Austria-Hungary may be gleaned from statistics giving the racial elements in this immigration during the years 1899 to 1910. Of the entire Austro-Hungarian immigration of 2,322,604 during this period, 98,000 were Bohemians; 29,000 Bulgarians, Servians, and Montenegrins; 331,000 Croatians and Slovenes; 31,000 Dalmatians, Bosnians and Herzegovinians; 265,000 Germans; 180,000 Hebrews; 19,000 Italians; 334,000 Magyars; 432,000 Polish (who are in our decadal lists included, however, among the Poles, and not among the Austro-Hungarians); 76,000 Roumanians; 144,000 Ruthenians and 374,000 Slovaks. Cf. *S. R. I.*, p. 53.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Rev. P. J. Gannon, S.J., "Religious Statistics in Ireland," in the *Catholic Mind*, vol. XIX, 1921. Cf. also *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, XVII, Jan., 1921; Rev. W. J. Lockington, S.J., *The Soul of Ireland*, Ch. XII, *The Martyrdom of Ireland*.

was really such greater proportion, among our immigrants from the Emerald Isle.

However, whether there really was an appreciably greater proportion of Catholics among the Irish immigrants remains somewhat of a debatable question. While it is true that the Catholic percentage in the Irish population decreased, at the same time the *number* of non-Catholics decreased also, so that whereas in 1831 there were 1,368,000 non-Catholics in Ireland there were in 1901 only 1,150,000 and in 1911 only 1,147,549. This fact proves beyond a doubt that many non-Catholics emigrated from Ireland—and in considerable numbers too, for it is a historical fact that many non-Catholics entered from England and Scotland during this period. Had none of these entered, it is quite possible that the Catholic proportion would have remained constant or very nearly so, leading to the conclusion that there was very nearly the same proportion of non-Catholics among the Irish emigrants as among the Irish population.

The following table presents statistics on these points for the period 1831 to 1911.

TABLE XIII

*Population of Ireland, by Religion, 1831 to 1911, by Decades.*

	Total	Catholic	Non-Catholic
1831 .....	7,767,401	6,369,268	1,368,133
1841 .....	8,175,124	6,703,598	1,471,526
1851 .....	6,552,385	5,201,908	1,350,477
1861 .....	5,798,564	4,609,685	1,188,879
1871 .....	5,412,377	4,141,933	1,270,044
1881 .....	5,174,836	3,961,891	1,212,945
1891 .....	4,704,750	3,547,307	1,159,443
1901 .....	4,458,775	3,308,661	1,150,114
1911 .....	4,390,219	3,242,670	1,147,549

Decrease in population: 44 per cent; in *number* of Catholics: 49 per cent.

As Table XIII indicates, the decrease in the total population was forty-four per cent; in the Catholic population forty-nine per cent; and in the non-Catholic population sixteen per cent. Numerically the decrease in the latter element was 220,584. Now had the decline amounted to 670,000 it would have been a forty-nine-per-cent decrease. In other words, if among the non-Catholic stock of 1911 only 450,000 were to represent immigrational stock—those who had entered the country from England and elsewhere since 1831, and their descendants—the 1911 non-Catholic population would present a loss of forty-nine per cent, considering the original element only, from the stock of 1831.

A study of statistics on the foreign born in Ireland during the decades from 1841 to 1911<sup>8</sup> discloses that immigration into Ire-

<sup>8</sup> *Census of Ireland, 1911.*

land of natives of England and Wales was about 115,000, of natives of Scotland, about 50,000, and of natives of other countries, about 40,000 during this period. It is hardly controvertible that the natives of England, Scotland and Wales who entered Ireland during the period were practically all Protestants. It is quite probable that most of the other immigrants were. A computation of the natural increase of this growing body of immigration stock indicates that it amounted to approximately 350,000 by 1911. Here is the chief reason why the Protestant element in Ireland had not decreased in greater proportion than it did. In addition to this, statistics disclose that there was an unprecedented increase in lunacy and pauperism especially in southern Ireland during this period. This can only be explained as the aftermath of the frightful horrors of the Famine. The natural-increase rate of the Catholics was unquestionably unduly lowered by the hardships consequent on the Famine. As has been previously remarked, this leads to the conclusion that the undue proportion of Catholics among Irish emigrants was not nearly so great as has been generally assumed.

This view is strengthened by a study of the gross emigration (to England and elsewhere as well as to the United States) from Ireland in the period from 1851 to 1910. During these years Munster was the only province to send out more emigrants than Ulster (the province with the greatest percentage of non-Catholics), while, from the point of view of the proportion which the emigration bore to the estimated average population of the provinces, two provinces sent a greater proportion and one less. Statistics for this period appear in the following table:

TABLE XIV<sup>9</sup>  
*Emigration from Ireland, by Province, 1851-1910.*

Province	Estimated Average Population	Emigration			Emigrants to Every 100 of the Average Population
		Males	Females	Total	
Munster ....	1,392,058	745,334	713,905	1,459,239	104.8
Connaught ..	827,532	329,655	271,917	701,572	84.8
Ulster .....	1,784,509	657,038	533,156	1,190,194	66.7
Leinster ....	1,349,831	381,848	343,851	735,699	53.8
Unspecified...	.....	61,766	48,973	110,739	...
Total ... .....	2,175,641	2,011,802	4,187,443	78.2	

To supplement the preceding statistics, a record of the population decrease by provinces is given for the period from 1861 to 1901.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. S. C. Johnson, *A History of Emigration from the United Kingdom to No. America 1763-1912*, London, 1913, p. 351.

TABLE XV<sup>10</sup>*Irish Population Decrease by Province, 1861-1901.*

Province	Population 1861	Population 1901	Numerical Decrease	Per Cent Decrease
Leinster . . . .	1,457,635	1,152,289	305,346	20.
Munster . . . .	1,513,558	1,107,088	306,470	20.
Ulster . . . .	1,914,236	1,582,286	331,950	17.
Connaught . . .	913,135	646,932	266,203	29.

(By 1911 Leinster had increased to 1,162,044; Munster had decreased to 1,035,495; Ulster to 1,581,695; and Connaught to 610,984.)

It may be estimated, from a consideration of the various data adduced, that there was perhaps a small, almost negligible, undue proportion of Catholics in the Irish immigration into the United States during the century. Whatever it may have been, full allowance is made for it in not deducting anything from the total Catholic percentage, as mentioned above.

In considering the Catholic percentage in non-Catholic countries not many difficulties are presented. In Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Greece, which, combined, sent to the United States a total of 2,518,264 immigrants during the century, the Catholic percentage is so small as to be almost negligible. In Denmark it increased from five one-hundredths of one per cent to three-tenths of one per cent during the period; in Norway the increase was from one one-hundredth of one per cent to eight one-hundredths of one per cent; in Sweden from one one-hundredth to five one-hundredths of one per cent, and in Greece from one-tenth to one-half of one per cent.

In Russia the increase was from five per cent to eight per cent. England and Wales showed an increase of from three to five per cent which was due chiefly to the influx of Irish immigrants, as was the case with Scotland also, where the Catholic percentage increased from three per cent in 1830 to ten per cent in 1920.

Previous to 1880 the Canadian percentage varies from twenty to twenty-five per cent. After that date statistics distinguish between French- and English-Canadians, the former being ninety per cent Catholic and the latter varying from twelve to eighteen per cent Catholic.

Germany, the Netherlands, and Switzerland are the only non-Catholic countries over one-third of whose inhabitants are Catholic. Germany increased from thirty to thirty-six and one-half per cent during the century, chiefly due to the acquisition of Alsace-Lorraine in the Franco-Prussian War.<sup>11</sup> The Netherlands

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *The Statesman's Year-Book*, 1878, 1905, and 1914. The census of Ireland was not taken in 1921.

<sup>11</sup> The return of Alsace-Lorraine to France is not taken into account, since it occurred in the last decade of the period and consequently had little practical effect from the statistical point of view.

remained practically constant at thirty-five per cent, and Switzerland increased from thirty-five to forty-three per cent.

The final category, listed in the decadal tables as "all other" includes immigrants from Asia—Chinese and Japanese and East Indians—as well as Turks, Roumanians and most of those of Balkan origin, and natives of the West Indies and the Pacific Islands. Practically the only Catholics among these are found among the West Indians and Pacific Islanders, this immigration, however, being of so temporary a nature that the Church in America gains few adherents therefrom. While it is clear that a very small percentage of Catholics can be found in this total of unspecified origin, nevertheless ten per cent is adopted in the decadal tables as a final measure to offset any possibility of under-estimating the total of Catholic immigrants from other sources. A summary of the religious statistics follows:

TABLE XVI  
*Catholic Percentage in immigration-furnishing Countries, 1830-1920.*

	1830	1840	1850	1860	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910	1920
Austr.-Hungary	73.	73.	73.	67.	67.	67.	67.	67.	67.	67.
Belgium .....	95.	95.	95.	95.	95.	95.	95.	95.	95.	95.
France .....	90.	90.	90.	90.	90.	90.	90.	90.	90.	90.
Ireland .....	82.	82.	80.	77.6	76.6	76.5	75.4	74.2	73.8	73.8
Italy .....	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.
Poland .....	75.	75.	75.	75.	75.	75.	75.	75.	75.	75.
Portugal .....	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.
Spain .....	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.
Mexico .....	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.	97.
Denmark .....	.05	.05	.05	.05	.11	.14	.14	.20	.30	.30
Germany .....	30.	30.	30.	32.	35.	35.9	35.8	36.	36.5	36.5
Greece .....	.10	.10	.10	.10	.50	.50	.50	.50	.50	.50
Netherlands ...	35.	35.	35.	35.	35.	35.	35.	35.	35.	35.
Norway .....	.01	.01	.01	.01	.016	.02	.05	.08	.08	.08
Russia .....	5.	5.	5.	5.	7.5	7.5	7.5	8.	8.	8.
Sweden .....	*	*	*	*	.01	.012	.014	.02	.03	.05
Switzerland ...	35.	35.	35.	35.	40.	40.	40.	40.	43.	43.
Eng. & Wales.	3.	3.	3.	3.	4.	4.4	5.	5.	5.	5.
Scotland .....	3.	3.	3.	3.	4.	5.	7.	8.	10.	10.
Canada .....	20.	25.	25.	25.	25.	30.	{E.12. F.90.	18.	18.	18.
All other .....	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.		90.	90.	90.

\*Included in Norway statistics.

## CHAPTER VIII

### CATHOLIC GROWTH FROM 1820 TO 1850

The necessary foundation having been laid in the preceding chapters, it is in order to proceed now to a study of the Catholic growth by decades during the century from 1820 to 1920. From 1820 to 1850 constitutes the first division of this period since after 1850 the United States Government began to gather and issue statistics of foreign born present in the country at each census year. This item, in default of exact statistics on emigration, makes it possible to gauge the net immigration with considerable degree of accuracy. Prior to 1850, however, it is necessary to depend on estimates, based on the law of averages. Hence 1850 is taken as the first division point in the century.

#### I. 1820-1830<sup>1</sup>

During this decade the political situation in Europe was such that little impetus was given to emigration. After having reorganized almost its entire political system in the Congress of Vienna, Europe seemed to afford to its population, depleted by an orgy of wars, a sufficiency of labor and opportunity for deriving a living during the reconstruction period, coupled with a hope of better conditions for the future. Events belied their hopes, however, but whether through their expectation of better times at home or because of the force of events which set Europe in a turmoil again, American immigration was light.

At the beginning of the decade a revolutionary epidemic swept over Latin Europe. Naples, Sicily, Piedmont, Portugal and Spain were the scene of struggles which finally came to an end through the intervention of Austria and France, while the successful revolution of the Greeks was approved by the powers of Europe. At the same time Latin America seized the opportunity to free itself from its dependency on foreign rule, and Mexico, Central America, Brazil, and many sections of South America, declared themselves independent states.

<sup>1</sup> Historical data, as distinct from purely immigration or statistical data, presented in this and following chapters, may be found in any general history or compendium of history. Cf. especially Weber, *General History of the Christian Era*, vol. II, Washington, 1922.

Hence despite considerable business activity in the United States, notably the construction of the Erie Canal, which was completed in 1825, only 143,000 foreigners came to our shores between 1820 and 1830. The statistics for this decade appear in the following table:

TABLE XVII<sup>2</sup>

*Total Immigration and net Catholic Immigration, 1820-1830.*

	Per Cent Cath.	Total Immi- gration	Net Catholic Immi- gration
Austria-Hungary .....	67.	0	0
Belgium .....	95.	27	25
Denmark .....	.05	169	0
France .....	90.	8,497	5,736
Germany .....	30.	6,761	2,197
Greece .....	.10	20	0
Italy .....	90.	408	316
Netherlands .....	35.	1,078	317
Norway and Sweden....	.01	91	0
Poland .....	75.	16	9
Russia .....	5.	75	3
Spain and Portugal.....	90.	2,622	2,006
Switzerland .....	35.	3,226	961
Eng. and Wales.....	3.	22,167	566
Ireland .....	82.	50,724	35,356
Scotland .....	3.	2,912	75
Canada .....	20.	2,277	388
Mexico .....	90.	4,817	3,686
All other .....	10.	27,752	2,359
 Total .....	..	143,439	54,000

Foreign-born aliens in U. S. in 1830, 113,309.

The method pursued in the treatment of the immigration statistics, as exemplified in Table XVII, is that outlined previously. In other words, the net Catholic immigration by country of origin, recorded in the final column of the table, is obtained, by ascertaining the Catholic percentage of the total immigration and then deducting five per cent for deaths, and ten per cent for returns, or departures to other countries, among the immigrants, during the decade. The result is that out of a gross immigration of 143,000 a net gain of 54,000 Catholics is recorded for the American Church, between 1820 and 1830.

During this period the number of aliens in the country had grown from 53,000 to 113,000, an increase of 60,000.<sup>3</sup> While

<sup>2</sup> Immigration statistics quoted in this and the following decadal tables are derived from *S. R. I.*, pp. 14 to 44, and from *S. A. U. S.*, p. 100.

<sup>3</sup> Previous to 1850 the United States did not list the number of foreign born by nationality. The censuses of 1820 and 1830 (that of 1840 did not list the aliens at all) listed the gross number of aliens not naturalized in the country. Cf. *S. R. I.*, p. 409.

the classification "foreigners not naturalized" (*i.e.* "aliens") is not so inclusive as "foreign born," and while, therefore, it would be inaccurate to use the two terms as synonymous, it is, nevertheless, clear that the two classifications at least approximate each other. Accordingly, a comparison between the gain of 60,000 in the number of aliens in the country, and that of 54,000 in the number of Catholics, through immigration, vindicates the method of the present computation as not at any rate minimizing the Catholic gain through this source. This is the best check-up provided by available sources.

During this decade, while welcoming these new members, the Church had grown much, and had spread to new fields after having with considerable difficulty overcome many obstacles. In 1821 the diocese of Richmond had been established, unfortunately, however, not so much because of the growth of Catholicity in Virginia, but rather because a party of malcontents, tainted with trusteeism, had succeeded in so misrepresenting their cause in Rome that this new diocese was cut off from Baltimore.<sup>4</sup>

In 1820 Charleston had been erected into a diocese through methods somewhat similar to those employed in connection with Richmond. The result was that the diocese of Baltimore was cut in two by intervening dioceses, since it still included the states of Mississippi and Alabama. At the same time, owing to the unsettled condition of the country, there was still some confusion as to jurisdictional rights between the sees of New Orleans and Baltimore.<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, to settle these difficulties, in 1824 Mobile became the seat of a prefecture apostolic, and after being raised to the dignity of a vicariate apostolic in 1825, became a diocese in 1829.

As early as this decade the population was already making its way westward. In New York the Church had followed the line of the Erie Canal, and parishes, planted chiefly by Irish canal laborers who settled along the line, sprang up at Utica, Rochester, Auburn, Carthage and other central points.<sup>6</sup> St. Louis and Cincinnati were the scenes of progress also, for many immigrants, especially German and Irish, following the great Cumberland road and the Pennsylvania route to the west, had carried the faith with them.<sup>7</sup> In 1821 Cincinnati was erected into a diocese, and in 1826 St. Louis became an episcopal see.

In 1829 the growing Church, through its representatives, met in

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, vol. III, p. 80 *seq.* For Catholic historical data in general throughout these chapters Shea has been drawn upon.

<sup>5</sup> *Ib.*, p. 378.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Murray, *Popular History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, p. 242.

<sup>7</sup> Shea, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

the first provincial council of Baltimore<sup>8</sup> and took active measures, by rigorous decrees, to curb the evil of trusteeism and the accompanying disorder of insubordinate priests, so many of whom had appeared, usually aiding and abetting the recalcitrant trustees. Owing to the unusual conditions prevailing in a new and rapidly growing country, immigrant priests who presented themselves to American bishops had often been accepted without an investigation of their records and antecedents. The results the American Church learned by sad experience.

In their action, the Fathers of the council were following the disciplinary example set them by the Supreme Pontiffs. In the case of the schismatics of Philadelphia and the insubordinate priest, Hogan, Pope Pius VII had been compelled to issue a Brief condemning the malcontents, in 1822, and enforcing this action by further measures in 1825.<sup>9</sup> In New Orleans the intermittent trouble had appeared again in 1828, drawing down upon the principals in the affair the scathing rebuke of Leo XII. It is a sad commentary on the obduracy of the misguided Sedella, the priest who was the chief instigator in the troubles in that city, that in the following year, although he died apparently in full communion with the Church, his funeral, which was a grand civic parade, was attended by the lodges of Freemasons in compliance with a special order of the Grand Lodge of the State,<sup>10</sup> there being in connection with this incident considerable evidence to prove that he was himself a Freemason and one in high standing. It is evident that such episodes could react only to the detriment of the sorely tried Church.

In the meanwhile, simultaneously with the growth of the Church and with the internal troubles, dangers threatened her from without. An ever growing spirit of hostility to the Church was manifest, aggravated to a great extent, by the reaction in the British Isles to the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829. Vile pamphlets raking over old calumnies and prejudices attested to the disfavor and even alarm with which the flourishing condition of the Church was viewed in some quarters. This menace of religious intolerance, ably but hopelessly combated by the bishops, especially through such early Catholic papers as the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, the *Truth Teller* and the *Jesuit*, was soon to blaze forth in the anti-Catholic riots and demonstrations and the nativist movements of ensuing years.<sup>11</sup>

Despite these untoward rumblings, converts were won in creditable numbers to the Church, the estimate of the total being 6,000, following the method already laid down, on the basis of 150 priests in 1820 and 232 in 1830.

<sup>8</sup> *Ib.*, p. 407.

<sup>9</sup> *Ib.*, p. 400.

<sup>10</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 245, 253.

<sup>11</sup> *Ib.*, p. 419.

The Catholic increase through immigration and conversion having been computed, the natural increase remains to be treated. During this decade the increase among the entire white population of the United States was thirty-four per cent.<sup>12</sup> This includes, however, the increase due to immigration, and after the proper deduction is made the natural increase is found to be slightly over thirty-two per cent. Applying this rate to the 195,000 Catholics of 1820, it follows that there was among them a natural increase of 63,000 during the decade. The total Catholic population of 1830, accordingly, is estimated at 318,000, made up of the 195,000 of 1820, 63,000 natural increase, 54,000 immigrational increase and 6,000 converts. There were now eleven dioceses contrasting with the six of 1820.

A summary of this decade follows:

TABLE XVIII  
Summary, 1820-1830.

U. S. white, 1820..	7,866,797	Cath. pop., 1820.....	195,000
Immigration .....	143,439	Cath. imm. inc.....	54,000
Increase by imm..	121,925	Cath. natural inc....	63,000
Foreign born, 1830.	113,309	Conversions .....	6,000
U. S. white, 1830..	10,537,378	Cath. pop., 1830.....	318,000

When one contrasts with the estimated Catholic population of the United States noted in the above table, the estimate of 361,000<sup>13</sup> based on the previous computation of Archbishop Marechal,<sup>14</sup> who died in 1828, there is a difference similar to that noted in the comparison of the estimate for 1820 presented in Table I, and that of the Archbishop (43,000 difference in 1830 as compared with 49,000 in 1820). Naturally, since this difference is practically the same for both decadal years (1820 and 1830), the explanation of the difference for 1830 is the same as for that of 1820; namely, that Archbishop Marechal had erred in computing the number of Catholics gained to the Church by the accession of Louisiana and Florida.<sup>15</sup>

Other authorities, however, estimate the 1830 Catholic population at an appreciably higher figure. It is, for example, stated that the fathers of the first provincial council of Baltimore (1829)

<sup>12</sup> More correctly it is placed at 33.7 per cent. For percentage of population increase by decades cf. *Negro Population in the United States, 1790-1915* (U. S. Government publication), p. 29, whence the statistics on this point, used throughout this study are drawn. The same statistics may also be found in *A. T. C.* For decadal rates of natural increase, eliminating immigration and emigration, cf. Table XLIIa.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Darras, *History of the Catholic Church*, Appendix, by Dr. White, translator.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. this work, p. 72.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. comment preceding Table I.

estimated the Catholic population as numbering over 500,000,<sup>16</sup> while in a table of statistics presented in the same work from which that statement is derived, the 1830 population is placed at 600,000.<sup>17</sup> To arrive at a just comparison between these estimates and that of Table XVIII (318,000) an analysis of the former, together with a study of the rate of Catholic growth which they posit in the preceding decades, is necessary. According to Murray's statistical table referred to above, the Catholic population of the United States in the decadal years in question was as follows:

1790	1800	1810	1820	1830
30,000	100,000 <sup>18</sup>	150,000	300,000	600,000

To consider these statistics<sup>19</sup> for the period from 1790 to 1820: Starting with a Catholic population of 30,000 in 1790 (5,000 less than the estimate of the present study), this table supposes the phenomenal increase of over 233 per cent in ten years, to a total of 100,000 Catholics in 1800; posits only fifty per cent increase for the next decade, thus listing 150,000 in 1810; and then lists in the following decade an increase of one hundred per cent, giving a total of 300,000 Catholics in 1820.

Now it is apparent from Government statistics, as indicated in the fourth chapter, that the natural increase of the American population was about thirty-three and one-third per cent for each decade. When this rate is applied to the 1790 population as stated by the statistics in question, these 30,000 would have grown to 40,000 in 1800, to 53,000 in 1810, and to 71,000 in 1820, thus leaving the not inconsiderable addition of 229,000 members to be explained by immigration and conversion. When it is remembered that the entire immigration from 1790 to 1820 was only 245,000,<sup>20</sup> and that the net immigration could not have been much over 190,000, and that, furthermore, most of these immigrants came during the last decade of the period (between 1810 and 1820) and hence could not have contributed any appreciable natural increase, it is seen that the statistics in question must suppose that absolutely every immigrant that came into the country during the period was a Catholic, that not one of them died or left the country, and that in addition, during the same years, there must have been the enormous total of nearly 40,000 conversions, in

<sup>16</sup> Murray, *op. cit.*, p. 235.

<sup>17</sup> P. 316. *The American Almanac* for 1826 estimated the Catholic population at the impossible figure of 1,071,000. Cf. *Encyclopediæ Americana*, ed. 1847, vol. XIV, p. 633.

<sup>18</sup> A note confesses uncertainty as to this figure.

<sup>19</sup> It must not be forgotten that all these statistics are only estimates and do not represent a census at all.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Chap. IV.

order to bring the 1820 Catholic membership up to the mark set. This is a *reductio ad absurdum*, for naturally such a supposition is simply ridiculous and absolutely impossible and untenable. In the same way the increase posited between 1820 and 1830, even granting the accuracy of the 1820 estimate, is equally impossible. The natural increase would have brought the Catholic population to 400,000 at the end of the decade (300,000 plus thirty-three and one-third per cent) thus leaving an additional increase of 200,000 to be explained otherwise. Official United States immigration statistics list an immigration of only 143,000 during the decade from 1820 to 1830, and it is accordingly unnecessary to point out how incredibly exaggerated and unacceptable are the estimates which place the 1830 Catholic population at 500,000 or 600,000. Even more fantastic do such estimates appear if one posit, as more probably the true figure, 200,000 as the 1820 population. The natural increase to 267,000 then leaves a further increment of 333,000 to be otherwise explained in the face of the same small immigration of 143,000.

In the face of all the evidence that has been herewith adduced the estimate of 318,000 presented in Table XVIII must be admitted as reasonable and in all likelihood very close to the actual figure, it being, however, impossible to say whether the latter was really higher or lower. The reader who has followed the statistics presented in the course of this study will readily understand the importance of the argument just set forth. It is, in fact, this very basis of an exaggerated Catholic population early in the century that has misled so many. Positing a proportionate growth, or even only a true growth on that false basis, and hence proclaiming at different periods that there should have been a higher Catholic population than was verified by contemporary estimates, writers have fallen back upon the only explanation left to them (except the careful analysis and correction of their estimates) and have come to the conclusion that there had been a great loss to the Church.<sup>21</sup>

## II. 1830-1840

The political situation in Europe during this decade was quite similar to that of the preceding ten years, although the popular unrest did not, perhaps, exist on such an extensive scale. The July Revolution of 1830 followed by the abdication of Charles X and the accession of Louis Philippe, the "citizen-king," marked the transfer of power in France from the aristocratic monarchy

<sup>21</sup> It is not at all the intention here to intimate that this intricate question is settled. The plea is merely for accuracy, mathematical so far as possible, and precision, and for the banishment of all exaggerated statements which cannot be shown to have a foundation in fact.

to the bourgeoisie, or middle class. In the results of this change is undoubtedly to be found the reason for the great increase of French immigration into the United States over the preceding period. Many royalists, dissatisfied with conditions at home, sought a refuge in America, evidently, however, only temporarily, for while 45,000 from France entered this country during this period and 77,000 in the following, there were only 54,000 natives of France in the United States in 1850 according to the census of that year. This discrepancy may be partially explained by the fact that some immigrants not of French nationality were registered as entering from France, but the major explanation is the temporary character of French immigration.

A revolution in Poland breaking out in 1830 ended in the complete subjection of that land by Russia in the following year, but the Belgian insurrection of the same year was more successful and after having had its independence recognized in 1831 and having repulsed, with the aid of the French, the attempt to reconquer her, Belgium finally was granted a guarantee of independence in 1839. The period was also marked by revolutionary activities in Germany (in Saxony, Hesse-Cassel, and Frankfort), in Italy, in Modena and the Papal States, parts of which were occupied by France and Austria from 1832 to 1838, and in Spain. To this revolutionary unrest is attributable a great part of the generally marked increase of immigration into the United States, Germany, for example, sending 152,000 to America during this decade as compared with 6,700 in the previous period.

England during this decade presented conditions favorable to emigration and hence there occurred a large increase in the number of immigrants entering the United States from the British Isles. The period was largely one of considerable unrest among the laboring and middle classes who were consequently grudgingly granted concessions by a Government which feared that the slumbering fires of resentment among the masses might break out into open revolt. After the passage of the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832 and the Municipal Reform Act of 1835, the laboring class, which had not been included in the relief provisions of these measures, started the famous Chartist agitation, the object of which was to obtain for laborers universal manhood suffrage.

It was the economic changes, however, which had a more direct bearing on emigration. In 1833 slavery was abolished in the British dominions, and in the same year the Factory Act, practically a child-labor law, was enacted, forbidding the employment of children below the age of nine in spinning and weaving mills. Although the abolition of slavery did not affect Britain itself in any very direct manner, the effect of the latter measure, humane act though it was, was at first to disturb the equilibrium of labor.

Though the measure tended to raise the wages of adults, at the same time, in many cases, it acted to lower the gross wages of a family, and while the country was seeking a readjustment to the new conditions much emigration resulted. Finally a further explanation is to be found in the protective policy of England at this time as evidenced especially by the Corn Laws. The "Corn Laws" in England were the measures imposing a protective tariff on grain, including such a staple as wheat, for the benefit of the farmer. This was the period of the industrialization of England and as a consequence, since the price of food was high and since this condition affected chiefly the laboring classes, there was an ever growing tendency among them for this reason also to seek relief in emigration. It is unnecessary to point out that conditions in Ireland were even worse than those in England, as a consequence of which over 200,000 Irish entered the United States during the decade.

While attention is drawn here to the more specific causes operating in the various countries, it must not be forgotten that the general and contributory causes treated of in the fifth chapter were also helping to increase the emigration from Europe. At the same time, there was during this decade a general condition all through Europe, the net result of which was probably to prevent an even greater increase in emigration. This was the appearance of the first great cholera epidemic of the century, which, having originated in India in 1817, had in 1830 reached Russia in Europe. It swept over England and Ireland in 1831 and thence proceeded to France, Spain and Italy, continuing to manifest itself until 1837. Over 52,000 deaths due to it were recorded in England and Wales alone. While undoubtedly many families, impoverished and depleted as a result of this disastrous visitation sought refuge in America, more probably, as was the case with the famous Black Death epidemic, the net result was to cause a greater demand for labor, with consequent increased pay and, to some extent, bettered conditions since the supply had been somewhat decreased.

In the United States, at least until the financial panic of 1837, conditions were even more conducive to European emigration than was the situation in Europe. The year 1816 had witnessed the inauguration of the commercial policy of "protection," by the enactment of the first "protective tariff" due to the war just ended and the rise of manufactures which had sprung up so generally in the United States when the country was prevented from importing from Europe goods which she needed. In 1824 a still higher tariff increasing the duties on wool, woolen and cotton goods, iron and hemp, further promoted American manufactures, while the tariff of 1828, the so-called "tariff of abominations" or the "woolen tariff of 1828" represented the high-water mark of pro-

tective legislation previous to the Civil War. The result was that, while the balance of trade in the United States around 1812 had consisted of an annual average excess import of over \$31,000,000, by 1842 the balance had become an annual average excess export of over \$18,500,000.<sup>22</sup> The change had been gradual with the cumulative effect chiefly apparent in the decade now under discussion, and the obvious consequence of the change was that while Europe, especially England, was losing an outlet for many of her commodities, the growing American market beckoned to the European laborers who had thereby been thrown out of employment. At the same time, however, the situation had its dangers, especially in view of the growing southern question, and in 1832 and 1833 the tariff, while remaining protective, had been somewhat decreased.

Concomitantly with the growth of manufactures the appearance of the railroad wrought a great change in the country, for, by opening up new land and by increasing and making easier the means of communication between distant points, it gave to the growth of the nation a sudden impetus, and hence opened the way to a greater immigration. From a total of 40 miles of railroad in 1830 after its introduction in the previous year, the increase had been to a total of 3,361 miles in 1841. The growth, however, had been too rapid, the development of the country was not able to keep pace, and chiefly because of this condition the year 1837 saw a severe financial panic; from a period of unprecedented prosperity the nation emerged into a season of near bankruptcy, and the flow of immigrants abruptly subsided.<sup>23</sup>

The general result of the interplay of causes was that nearly 600,000 immigrants entered the United States during the decade and of the 509,000 increase in population due to this movement 240,000 (nearly one-half) are computed as additions to the membership of the American Church.

Statistics for the decade are presented in the table which appears on the following page.

In accordance with the statistics presented in Table XIX it can be seen that the increase in the Catholic population, through immigration alone, was about seventy-five per cent of the Catholic membership of 1830.

After making due allowance for immigrational increase the rate of natural increase for this period is found to be thirty per cent, giving an increase, through this source, of 95,400 Catholics. The number of priests, too, was increasing at a gratifying rate. While

<sup>22</sup> Cf. *S. A. U. S.*, annual; census abstracts; yearbooks, e.g. *World Almanac*, 1923, p. 217.

<sup>23</sup> The immigration of 1837 was 79,000, while in 1838 only 38,000 entered the country. Cf. *S. R. I.*, pp. 19, 20.

it is true that throughout the period since 1790 the American bishops, especially those of the newer dioceses, had to seek priests in Europe, yet a good beginning had been made toward the acquisition of a native priesthood. Besides old St. Mary's and Mt. St. Mary's in Maryland, there was a seminary in each of the dioceses of Cincinnati, New York, and Philadelphia, together with a few smaller ones elsewhere, while numerous Catholic schools and colleges furnished a constantly growing number of candidates for the priesthood. During the decade the number of priests had increased from 232 to 482, and the conversions are therefore estimated at 9,400. The total Catholic population in 1840 was accordingly 663,000.

TABLE XIX

*Total Immigration and net Catholic Immigration, 1831-1840.*

	Per Cent Catholic	Total Immigration	Net Catholic Immigration
Austria-Hungary .....	67.	0	0
Belgium .....	95.	22	17
Denmark .....	.05	1,063	1
France .....	90.	45,575	33,867
Germany .....	30.	152,454	38,876
Greece .....	.10	49	0
Italy .....	90.	2,253	1,725
Netherlands .....	35.	1,412	420
Norway and Sweden.....	.01	1,201	0
Poland .....	75.	369	236
Russia .....	5.	277	42
Spain and Portugal.....	90.	2,954	2,261
Switzerland .....	35.	4,821	1,435
England and Wales.....	3.	73,143	1,865
Ireland .....	82.	207,381	144,545
Scotland .....	3.	2,667	62
Canada .....	25.	13,624	2,746
Mexico .....	90.	6,599	5,049
All other .....	10.	83,214	7,073
<hr/>			
Total.....		599,125	240,220

During this decade the American population had been steadily, if slowly, moving westward, as evidenced by the fact that the center of population had traveled fifty-five miles westward in the period.<sup>24</sup> The changes in the political organization of the country give evidence of this western development. By 1830 the only portion of the country east of the Mississippi which had not been parceled into states was Michigan territory, while west of the Mississippi there were two states (Louisiana and Missouri) and Arkansas territory organized, leaving the great expanse of Missouri territory as yet unorganized. By 1840 Arkansas and Michigan had entered the union, the small Wisconsin territory remained

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *A. T. C.*, p. 30.

the only non-state east of the Mississippi, and on the west bank of the river Iowa territory had been organized by assigning to it the land now occupied by Iowa, Minnesota and the eastern part of the Dakotas, while the rest of Missouri territory was now known as the Indian country, its frontier being the western boundary of the original Louisiana Purchase.<sup>25</sup> The section known in census statistics as "East north central" (practically the old Northwest territory) now had a population of nearly 3,000,000, while Iowa and Missouri boasted 426,000 inhabitants.<sup>26</sup>

Steadily the Church, too, had advanced westward with the growing population and three new dioceses—Detroit (1833), Vincennes (1834; later transferred to Indianapolis), and Dubuque (1837)—had been founded in the developing territory. In the south the two new sees of Natchez and Nashville had also been erected, making a total of sixteen sees in 1840. True, the new frontier sees were in the beginning only able to struggle for an existence, owing to the paucity of priests and the scattered flocks, and the consequent lack of means; but they blazed the way, however, and were on the ground ready for the remarkable development of the succeeding decades. The struggling condition of these pioneer dioceses, it may be noted here, was due in great measure to the fact that while the immigration contained a goodly number of Catholics it was not generally the latter who pressed forward to the west, but rather the natives, the newcomers generally preferring to congregate in the cities.

During this decade the ravages of the cholera epidemic, which reached America in 1832, took a heavy toll of priests and nuns, who were untiring in their efforts to care for the stricken people. Undoubtedly this scourge greatly retarded the growth of the Church, since it was chiefly from the ranks of the poor (and this category includes most of the faithful), that the victims were taken. In New York during the height of the epidemic so widespread were the ravages that the time for Masses on Sundays was not regular, but depended on the emergency sick calls summoning the priests to care for the dying.<sup>27</sup> In Baltimore, Philadelphia, Cincinnati and other cities conditions were similar, while in New Orleans the dreaded yellow fever combined with the cholera to decimate the people.

Despite the stringent action which had been taken against the evil, trusteeism again made its appearance, to the inevitable detriment of the Church, during this period. In New York Bishop DuBois was forced to struggle with the trustees of the Cathedral, and in Philadelphia a regular schism was engineered by the trus-

<sup>25</sup> Cf. *C. P. G.*, p. 52.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. *A. T. C.*, p. 25.

<sup>27</sup> Shea, *op. cit.*, p. 501

tees of St. Mary's Church, ending only after the church had been under interdict for some time.

From without, too, dangers still threatened the Church, and between 1830 and 1840 rampant bigotry reared its head in several riotous and destructive attacks, indicative of an undercurrent of hostility to the Catholic Church quite general throughout the country. In Charlestown, Mass., in 1834 a mob destroyed and burned at night the Ursuline convent while the firemen stood idly by, watching the scene; in 1838 St. Mary's Church at Burlington, Vermont was burned by a riotous mob; and in New York, in 1831, another St. Mary's Church was similarly a prey to arson. This decade, too, saw Maria Monk, the impostor, foisting her wares upon a gullible and eager public; in New York a "Protestant Association" with its organ the *Protestant* fanned the flames of bigotry with calumnies and lies, while in the West, at Evansville, Indiana, Fr. Weinzoepflein was the victim of a vile plot which sent him to prison where he was forced to remain until a revulsion of feeling turned the tables against his persecutors. However, though the vicissitudes of the Church were many and varied, its progress had been consistent, as has been pointed out.

A summary of this decade appears in the following table:

TABLE XX  
Summary, 1831-1840.

U. S. white, 1830.....	10,537,378	Cath. pop., 1830.....	318,000
Immigration .....	599,125	Cath. imm. inc.....	240,000
Increase by imm.....	509,255	Cath. natural inc.....	95,400
Foreign born <sup>28</sup> .....	750,000	Conversions .....	9,600
U. S. white, 1840.....	14,195,805	Cath. pop., 1840.....	663,000

The foregoing table records a growth of nearly one hundred and ten per cent in Catholic membership during this decade. Yet this estimate for 1840 hardly even approximates the figure which is usually named for the Catholic population of that year. Thus Bishop England, of Charleston, estimated the number of Catholics in 1836 as 1,200,000.<sup>29</sup> Gilmary Shea, using Archbishop Marechal's estimate as his basis, adopts 1,000,000 as the number, while Prof. Schemm, following Bishop England, enumerates 1,300,000 Catholics in 1840,<sup>30</sup> and Murray, rising to still greater heights reaches an estimate of 1,500,000.<sup>31</sup>

At the risk of becoming wearisome by repetition it is necessary to analyze the situation as was done for the end of the preceding

<sup>28</sup> Estimated; the number of foreign born was not listed in the census of 1840.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. *Works of Bishop England*, J. Murphy, 1849, vol. III, p. 226.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. O'Gorman, *op. cit.*, p. 494.

<sup>31</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 316.

decade, in order to show that these estimates are far in excess of what the true figure could possibly have been. It is plain from all that has preceded that the Catholic population of 1820 could not reasonably have been more than 200,000. Now the only possible way this number could have increased to over a million in 1840 is by supposing that absolutely every immigrant that entered the country between 1820 and 1840 was a Catholic and furthermore that none of them died or left the country. Even under this impossible and absurd supposition the Catholic population would only have been 1,130,000 in 1840. Thus the 200,000 of 1820 with thirty-three and one-third per cent natural increase and 143,000 immigrants would have become 400,000 in 1830, and the latter figure with 130,000 natural increase and with the entire immigration of 600,000 added would have grown to 1,130,000 by the end of the next decade (1840).

It is greatly to be regretted that the estimate of Bishop England (1,200,000 in 1836) has for so many years passed current, for it is precisely upon this estimate of his that the bulk of later statements in regard to the growth or lack of growth of the Church rests. A writer has truly said, "To count is a modern practice; the ancient method was to guess; and where numbers are guessed they are always magnified." Bishop England made a guess; he made an estimate in a thoroughly unscientific manner, greatly overestimating the amount of immigration, yet not having recourse to any data. As he himself confesses, he had none and did not think any existed, for his estimate is the result of a computation made while on a journey to Rome, far from the source of information, and it is based chiefly on impressions, as he himself, in the passage referred to, openly admits.<sup>32</sup> While dismissing this question here, as it is treated at length in a later chapter,<sup>33</sup> it is well to insist again on the evident exaggeration in the estimates quoted and to claim for the lower figure of 663,000 an undoubtedly probable degree of reasonableness and accuracy, based as it is on an accumulation of corroboratory data.

### III. 1841-1850

The storm which had for years been brewing in Europe broke in full force during this decade, reaching its crest in 1848 when nearly the whole Continent was in a state of turmoil and revolution. In France and Germany, more especially, perhaps, in the former country, the socialist movement had made great headway since the French Revolution (of 1789). Under the name of socialists, at this time, were comprised, in general, all those who

<sup>32</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Chap. XIV.

considered the work of the Revolution incomplete and who favored reforms, especially the reorganization of society. This was the period of the invention and development of machinery, the first effect of the introduction of which was to reduce the number of necessary laborers, and, at the same time, the wages of the workers. The theories of socialism which had been broached previously were in 1840 popularized by Louis Blanc in his book *Labor Organization*. As an inevitable accompaniment, or consequence, of the socialist fever, radicalism and unrest, manifested by dissatisfaction with conditions as they existed, rapidly spread throughout Europe. It is impossible to measure mathematically the influence of this situation on American immigration, but, as pointed out in Chapter V, it did have considerable influence, causing as it did conservatives to seek a more peaceful atmosphere in the United States, and radicals to emigrate to a foreign land, either by necessity or choice, in the hope that possibly there they might find more fertile soil for the development of their theories, or perhaps even a state of labor which would satisfy their need of more abundant employment and more remunerative returns. As a matter of fact, due to these causes and to the Irish famine, and to the ever-operating usual influences, American immigration during this decade, with its total of over 1,700,000, almost tripled that of the preceding period.

In France the new dynasty of 1830 (the July Monarchy) met opposition from the two opposite camps of the Catholic and the Socialist parties. The former had come into being to combat the strong anti-Catholic agitation which marked the beginning of Louis Philippe's reign while the latter, as indicated above, were seeking a change in social conditions. The trend toward democratic reforms was pronounced in the demands and attitude of the people and when, in 1848, the Government sought to put an end to the "campaign of banquets" by which the movement was being furthered, Louis Philippe was by force of circumstances, compelled, in face of an insurrection, to abdicate. The provisional Government, having proclaimed a republic and universal manhood suffrage, was succeeded by the Constituent Assembly which presided over the election of Louis Napoleon to the presidency in December, 1848. However, disorder was general during this and the following years because the radicals felt disappointed in not finding the Utopia which they had envisioned for themselves. Owing to the generally disturbed state of affairs France sent to the United States over 77,000 during this decade, as compared with 45,000 in the previous period.

In Germany, also, the popular movement, which was nationalizing in character as well as democratizing, found fertile soil, and Germany, just as it had done after the French uprising of 1830,

disclosed the ferment under the political surface by widespread insurrection in 1848, following the action of the radicals in France in that year. Moreover, a second cholera epidemic, more deadly than that of the previous decade, reached Germany in 1847 and that year was the banner one of the decade for American immigration from Germany, with 74,000 arrivals, the total for the ten years being nearly 450,000.

Although the revolutionary crisis in Austria, Hungary, and Italy was even graver than in France and Germany, reference to it here is hardly necessary since it did not result in sending any appreciable number to America.

In England and Ireland the revolutionary wave was not so conspicuous. The political unrest in England was noted chiefly in the "Chartist" agitation, a movement whereby the common people sought universal manhood suffrage and other electoral reforms. The Chartists, however, overreached themselves in 1848 by presenting to Parliament a monster petition which, upon examination, proved to bear innumerable names which were either entirely fictitious, or belonged to opponents of the movement. This failure, together with the cholera and the adoption of free trade by Britain in 1846, evidently served to increase greatly the number of British arrivals in the United States.

Irish immigration rose in this decade to the hitherto unprecedented total of 780,000. In this case the chief cause is evident—the Great Famine which devastated Ireland from 1845 to about 1850. In 1845 the potato crop, the staple product of Ireland, was a partial failure, and in the two following years a complete failure. A terrible famine resulted and thousands perished miserably. The charity of the civilized world was aroused and supplies were rushed to the stricken island, notably from the United States.<sup>34</sup> The cholera, too, added to the misery of the population and the impoverished and, in many cases, dying, survivors fled the

<sup>34</sup> The blight which destroyed the potato fields did not injure the grain, but the landlords disposed of the grain of the peasants by distraint in default of rent and then evicted the helpless victims, sick and dying as they were, when no more could be squeezed from them. "While myriads starved to death in Ireland, ships bursting with grain and laden with cattle were leaving every port for England. There would have been no need to emigrate if their food did not emigrate. But the exhausting results of the Union had brought matters to a point that compelled Ireland to sell her food to supply the money drain. The food is first taken away and then its price is taken away also. The Union has stripped them (the Irish people) of their means and the only alternatives left to the perishing multitude were the work-house, emigration, or the grave." Cf. O'Neil Daunt, *Ireland and Her Agitators*, p. 231, quoted in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. VIII, p. 136, Art. "Irish." Cf. also L. Paul-Dubois, *Contemporary Ireland*, p. 73: "During the most critical period of the famine, in 1846 and 1847, Ireland exported corn, barley, oats and cattle in far greater quantities than would have sufficed to feed the people."

land in a veritable exodus, the numbers swelled by the failure of the abortive Young Ireland insurrection of 1848. Canada and the United States welcomed the refugees, only, however, in thousands upon thousands of cases, to provide a grave for those who were unable to resist longer the ravages of disease and the rigors of the sea trip and the fearsome ship fever. In Canada the newly landed Irish died at the rate of 100, 150 and 200 a day, in some places their only shelter from the elements being a rude lean-to shed, their only protection from the ground a handful of straw, since the native population was fearful that admission of the new arrivals into their cities might succeed only in spreading disease and its consequent terrors. On Gross Isle alone as many as 10,000 or 12,000 were consigned to the grave-pit, five thousand of the total being simply described as unknown.<sup>35</sup> In the United States the hospitals of the eastern cities were filled with the stricken Irish, it being impossible to estimate the number of deaths in these institutions, to say nothing of the large number who succumbed in private homes. That the sufferings of this decade coupled with the years of want which preceded and followed, weakened the Irish race almost *en masse* can hardly be doubted, and this supposition goes far to explain the findings of experts of recent years who state that the Irish in this country have a high mortality and a low expectancy of life,<sup>36</sup> the consequence of which is, naturally, that the Catholic increase through Irish immigrational stock is considerably retarded below what it should normally be.

The political and financial background in America continued to be such as to conduce to the increase of immigration. A quick recovery had followed the panic of 1837 and by the year 1846 a tariff for revenue only was adopted, partly because of the flourishing condition of American industries and partly as a compromise with the south, between whom and the north the question of slavery, with its many ramifications, was now approaching a

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Maguire, *op. cit.*, pp. 134, 148.

<sup>36</sup> According to Mr. Louis I. Dublin, statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., the Irish in New York City have the highest mortality and the lowest expectancy of life. L. I. Dublin, Paper read at Second International Congress of Eugenics, held in New York, Sept., 1921; Austin O'Malley, M.D., "Irish Vital Statistics in America," in *Studies*, vol. VII, Dec., 1918: "What is true of New York City is true of all closely inhabited parts of the country, for the New York City rate is low," p. 623; Jas. J. Walsh, M.D., "Irish Mortality in New York and Pennsylvania," in *Studies*, vol. X, 1921; Gladden W. Baker, "The Trend of Adult Mortality in the United States," in *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. XVIII, Sept., 1923, p. 852; L. I. Dublin and G. W. Baker, "The Mortality of Race Stocks in Pennsylvania and New York," *ibid.*, vol. XVII, March, 1920, p. 13: "death rate high for Italians, Germans, Irish; death rates greatly in excess of native stock," p. 37; the *Catholic World*, vol. CXV, Nov., 1921, p. 285; Wm. R. Grace, *The Irish in America*, p. 21; this work p. 97; and Tables XXXVII, XXXVIII, XLI.

critical stage. This era, too, saw the invention of the telegraph and the sewing machine; and, despite the Indian wars and the war with Mexico the acquisition of new territory and the development of the country, especially by the continued spread of railroads, brought about a period of prosperity.

In 1846 a treaty with Great Britain settled the dispute as to the northwest boundary of the United States, and in 1848, as a consequence, Oregon territory was organized. In 1845 Texas, which had broken away from Mexico and constituted itself an independent republic, entered the American Union. A dispute with Mexico as to the boundary of Texas led to war in the following year, and the treaty of peace in 1848 resulted in the acquisition by the United States of what is now California, New Mexico, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, and part of Colorado and Wyoming, so that, with the exception of the small strip acquired by the Gadsden Purchase in 1853, the United States at the end of the Mexican War had reached its full continental development, if we except Alaska.

In the very year of the treaty gold was discovered in California and the rush of "forty-niners" hastened, probably by decades, the development and peopling of the new territory, thus opening an immense field for expansion as immigration would call ever more insistently for increased opportunities and new outlets to prevent undue congestion, especially on the eastern coast. The East with its total of over 8,500 miles of railroad, and the West with its promise of rich homesteads and its lure of gold, gave promise of their ability to absorb the phenomenal population growth of the country. Five new states were admitted into the Union during the decade.

The growth of the country and of the Church through immigration during the decade is set forth in statistics on the following page. It will be noticed that for the first time complete statistics for the foreign born, by nationality, are available for the year 1850. As will be apparent from the treatment of the subject in the following chapter this factor is of great value in determining the true net gain by immigration during the years for which there are no statistics covering the emigration from the country.

Although there was a recrudescence of trusteeism and a continuation and in fact an increase of persecution from without, the Church enjoyed a marked and fruitful growth from all points of view during the decade. Trusteeism manifested itself in Boston, New York, Buffalo, Philadelphia and especially in New Orleans where the president of the trustees of the cathedral was in 1843 the Grand Master of the Foyer Lodge of Masons.<sup>36a</sup>

In a certain sense offsetting the harm done by trusteeism, anti-Catholic riots and demonstrations served to weld the members of

<sup>36a</sup> Shea, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 267.

TABLE XXI <sup>37</sup>

*Total Immigration and net Catholic Immigration, 1841-1850, and Foreign Born by Nationality, 1850.*

	Per Cent Catholic Immigration	Total Catholic Immigration	For. Born 1850	Net Catholic Immigration
Austria-Hungary . . . . .	67.	0	946	535
Belgium . . . . .	95.	5,074	1,313	2,000
Denmark . . . . .	.05	539	1,838	0
France . . . . .	90.	77,262	54,069	25,000
Germany . . . . .	30.	434,626	583,774	110,831
Greece . . . . .	.10	16	86	0
Italy . . . . .	90.	1,870	3,679	1,431
Netherlands . . . . .	35.	8,251	9,848	2,455
Norway and Sweden . . . . .	.01	13,903	12,678	2
Poland . . . . .	75.	105	....	65
Portugal . . . . .	90.	550	1,274	421
Russia . . . . .	5.	551	1,414	20
Spain . . . . .	90.	2,209	3,113	1,691
Sweden . . . . .	..	....	3,559	....
Switzerland . . . . .	35.	4,644	13,358	1,382
England and Wales . . . . .	3.	263,332	308,543	6,715
Ireland . . . . .	80.	780,719	961,719	530,890
Scotland . . . . .	3.	3,712	70,550	94
Canada . . . . .	25.	41,723	147,711	8,865
Mexico . . . . .	90.	3,271	13,317	2,503
All other . . . . .	10.	69,894	41,813	5,877
Total . . . . .		1,713,251	2,244,602	700,777

the Church into a sturdier, more aggressive and more enthusiastic body, while, at the same time, the "advertising" thus given to the Church undoubtedly helped in many cases to bring about the numerous conversions of the period, of which not a few occurred in cultured circles. In Baltimore threatened mob destruction of the Carmelite convent was averted only by the watchful vigilance of a military guard, which remained on duty for three days until the danger was passed. In New York grave trouble was avoided only by the bold stand of Bishop Hughes when by a brave charge to his people, who eagerly rallied around him, he struck terror into the hearts of the cowardly members of the Know-Nothing movement. The enemies of the Church incontinently turned from their course when they sensed the inevitableness of a real conflict, and the Catholics won the day. In Philadelphia it had been different. There the rabble had risen and burned several churches, had destroyed numerous Catholic homes and had butchered many unoffending Catholics, practically with the connivance of those whose duty it was to prevent such inhuman disorders. In the diocese of Cincinnati, too, a church was sacrilegiously burned by a mob, and in New Orleans a band of ruffians assailed the plant

<sup>37</sup> Foreign born statistics for period to 1900 (inc.) are taken from *S. R. I.*, p. 416.

of a Catholic newspaper and made a vile attack on the Ursuline convent, where, however, they desisted after breaking doors and windows and hurling low insults at the devoted nuns.

The source of the agitation lay in the Know-Nothing movement—the so-called “American” party—for whom the Catholic school was anathema, and the reading of the Protestant Bible in the public school a veritable article of faith. This phase of the movement caused considerable trouble in practically all the dioceses, but especially in Detroit, New York, Philadelphia, and in Kentucky where a “Protestant League” was formed to attempt to stem the tide of growing Catholicism. Even in the army the spirit manifested itself, Catholics among the forces invading Mexico being unjustly treated, and it being openly asserted that the military were to enrich themselves by looting the riches of the Mexican churches.

Yet despite the widespread opposition—and to a certain extent, because of it—the Church pursued the even tenor of her way, multiplying dioceses, building churches and schools and colleges, and welcoming to her fold the constant accession of new members. So rapid was the growth of the Church that at the end of 1850 she presented a comprehensive hierarchical organization, covering the country from coast to coast, and numbering thirty-two dioceses (six of which were now archiepiscopal sees) or exactly twice the number of 1840, when there was one archdiocese with fifteen suffragans. In 1840 Dubuque was the frontier diocese; in 1850 there were three sees on the Pacific coast. In 1843 the erection of Hartford testified to progress in New England, while in the West, in the same year, Pittsburgh (which then was considered as belonging to the West), Chicago, Milwaukee, and Little Rock were made diocesan sees, and Oregon City was erected into a vicariate apostolic. In 1846 Walla Walla was added (to be transferred to Nesqually in 1850), and in 1847, Albany, Buffalo, Cleveland and Galveston, the latter perfecting the older organization of the Texas vicariate which had been instituted in 1841. In 1850 Wheeling, Savannah, St. Paul and Santa Fé became dioceses, as did also Monterey (known as Monterey and Los Angeles) which took the place of the Californian hierarchical organization which had existed under Mexican rule. At the same time, the need of more metropolitan sees was apparent, and in 1846 Oregon City became an archdiocese, followed by St. Louis in 1847, and New York, Cincinnati and New Orleans in 1850. True, many of the new dioceses were poor and ill equipped (in the diocese of Little Rock, for example, the newly appointed bishop estimated that the Catholics did not number over seven hundred souls, with but one priest and two churches, each loaded with a heavy debt) <sup>38</sup>

<sup>38</sup> Shea, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 285.

but the course of Rome was justified by the future and it was rather an added advantage than otherwise for the Church thus to be beforehand with its organization in the rapidly growing sections of the country.

In harmony with the increase in the number of dioceses, the Church registered at the same time a phenomenal increase in membership. In fact, the Catholic population of the country almost *tripled* during the decade. As indicated in Table XXI, the Catholic increase by immigration is set at nearly three-quarters of a million, or practically fifty per cent of the entire net immigration. In making the computation for this decade only the usual amount of fifteen per cent was deducted, in the case of the Germans and Irish, to cover the loss by deaths,<sup>39</sup> returns, and departures. It is apparent that such a course adds greatly to the net Catholic gain among these two nationalities, since the deaths alone must have been at least fifteen per cent, if not even higher, when account is taken of the terrible conditions prevalent, especially in Ireland, and the cholera epidemic which took its toll in this country as well as in Europe. It has seemed advisable not to make any change in the computation in the case of the two countries which sent us during this decade over two-thirds of the entire immigration that entered the country, in order that even the slightest danger of minimizing the number of Catholic immigrants may be avoided. Thus, if there was any greater proportion of Catholics among the Irish entering this country than among the general Irish population,<sup>40</sup> the excess is certainly accounted for by this allowance. Furthermore, in the case of the Germans there is really no evidence to lead one to think that an undue number of Catholics was entering the United States; rather there are some indications that the radical element in Germany was furnishing the great bulk of our German immigrants. Hence it is clear that to deduct only fifteen per cent for deaths, returns and departures in this case leaves no room to doubt that there is thus enumerated a total Catholic net immigration which was if anything above the actual gain that took place.

In computing the natural increase for this decade the rate is found to be approximately thirty per cent. The full rate of population increase was 37.7 per cent, but over eight per cent is to be deducted as due to immigration. In addition, then, to the 700,000

<sup>39</sup> Reference in this connection is always to deaths among the immigrants of the current decade—not among the total foreign born already present, these latter being counted in the computation of the natural increase in the country.

<sup>40</sup> It will be remembered from Chapter VII that the question is at best only doubtful. For example, in the period from 1851 to 1910, Ulster, which is 43.7 per cent non-Catholic, contributed 29 per cent of the entire Irish emigration. Cf. Table XV.

Catholic immigrants there occurred a natural increase of 198,900. The number of converts may be roughly estimated at 18,000 (nearly as high as ten per cent of the natural increase) for the decade, the number of priests rising from 482 in 1842 to 1,800 in 1850. This noteworthy increase is attributable in great measure to the turmoil in Europe, owing to which many French and German priests left their native land, while their ranks were swelled by many Swiss Jesuits as their society was expelled from Switzerland in 1847.

There was also a minor source of accretion of Catholics during this decade—the acquisition of new territory. In the case of Texas and Oregon the acquisition brought no true increase as it merely served to bring back into the Union citizens (and their descendants) who had migrated thither but a short time before.<sup>41</sup> With New Mexico the situation was different. The population of this territory by the census following its acquisition (1850) was found to be 61,547. Of these, 58,000 were born in New Mexico. Allowing for the natural tendency of many of these to go back to Mexico, their own country, as happened with the Spaniards of Florida, most of whom left after the acquisition of that section by the United States, it seems a reasonable estimate to place the Catholic gain through this source at 26,000.

The summary for this decade follows:

TABLE XXII

Summary, 1841-1850.

U. S. white, 1840.....	14,195,805	Cath. pop., 1840.....	663,000
Immigration .....	1,713,251	Cath. imm. inc.....	700,000
		Cath. territorial inc...	26,000
Increase by imm.....	1,456,263	Cath. natural inc.....	198,900
Foreign born, 1850.....	2,244,602	Conversions .....	18,000
U. S. white, 1850.....	19,553,068	Cath. pop., 1850.....	1,606,000

From the foregoing table it can be seen that the Catholic population almost tripled during this one decade. The resources of the American Church were severely strained to make it possible to assimilate all her new children, but, as stated above, Rome was forehanded in her care of the Church here and the hierarchical machinery was made ready even before the great tide of increase swept in upon us. The number of dioceses had doubled, the number of priests was almost four times as great in 1850 as in 1840,

<sup>41</sup> Cf. *Compendium of United States Census*, 1850, p. 39. Of the 13,000 residents of Oregon in 1850, only 3,000 were born in Oregon. Of the 212,000 inhabitants of Texas, practically all the whites came from other sections of the United States, while 58,000 were colored. *Ib.* pp. 116, and 83; cf. also *Negro Population in the United States, 1790 to 1915*, p. 44. Cf. Table LXX.

churches and stations now numbered 1,605 as compared with 812 in 1840, while there were now twenty-nine ecclesiastical institutions, seventeen colleges, and ninety-one academies for girls, where there had been only thirteen, nine, and forty-seven respectively in 1840.<sup>42</sup>

A consultation of other estimates of the Catholic membership for 1850 brings to light the usual anomalies. Murray's table,<sup>43</sup> for example, supposes that the increase during the decade was from 1,500,000 in 1840 to 3,500,000 in 1850. For the proof of the proposition that his 1840 estimate of 1,500,000 is too high the reader is referred to the discussion of the 1840 statistics.<sup>44</sup> To consider, however, the statistics for this decade, without reference to others, it will be seen that the increase is impossible even granting the correctness of his 1840 figure. Thus a thirty per cent natural increase would have amounted to 450,000, while the convert increase of 18,000 added to this would leave a balance of 1,632,000 gain through other sources (Murray's table posits a total gain of 2,000,000) which could be explained only by immigration. Yet the entire gross immigration of the decade was only 1,713,000 and the net immigration was not as high as 1,500,000. The statistics referred to would claim that absolutely every immigrant during the decade was a Catholic and even then would fail by 132,000 to account in this way for the entire increase. The errors of these early estimates were, unfortunately, cumulative; the discrepancy grows with each decade, but a careful analysis discloses the fallacy beyond any possibility of a doubt.

Prof. Schemm's estimate places the 1850 Catholic population at 1,433,350. The estimate in itself is reasonable, but there is actually a greater fallacy in this estimate than in the one just referred to. The fallacy is apparent when it is remembered that his estimate for 1840 was 1,300,000.<sup>45</sup> He has thus allowed only ten per cent to cover the accretions due to immigration, to natural increase and to conversions during the ten years, when the natural increase alone was thirty per cent. On his base he should have arrived at a much higher estimate for 1850. While his error is on the other side this time, it serves to show the disregard of mathematics in his method of computation.

Gilmary Shea, who made an interesting study of the question, estimates the Catholics of 1850 at 1,726,470,<sup>46</sup> only slightly over the figure presented in Table XXII. The discrepancy is easily explained by the fact that he based his 1820 estimate on the com-

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Murray, *op. cit.*, p. 316.

<sup>43</sup> *Loc. cit.* <sup>44</sup> P. 125.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. p. 125.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. O'Gorman, *op. cit.*, p. 496. This is not in agreement with other estimates recorded by Shea; 811,800 for 1844 and 1,698,300 for 1853; Shea, *op. cit.*, vol. IV, p. 715.

putation of Archbishop Marechal,<sup>47</sup> and with this correction allowed for, his estimate is practically in agreement with the present one, as it is, in fact, substantially dependent on the same method of reliance on concrete statistics.

Finally, as illustrative of another "school of thought" one may refer to the Baptist Almanac for 1850, which lists the number of Catholics in that year as 1,173,000,<sup>48</sup> and to another Protestant work<sup>49</sup> which gives the Catholic population of 1844 as 1,300,000.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. p. 72 this work.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. *Compendium of United States Census*, 1850, p. 138.

<sup>49</sup> I. D. Rupp, *An Original History of Religious Denominations in the U. S.*, p. 112.

## CHAPTER IX

### CATHOLIC GROWTH FROM 1850 TO 1870

From 1850 to 1870 a new factor is used in computing the net gain through immigration—namely, the number of foreign born in the country at each census year. In default of exact emigration data a consideration of the factor named makes it possible to gauge fairly accurately the extent of the return movement and the number of deaths among the current immigrants. The method will be explained in detail when the decadal tables of this period are discussed. After 1870 emigration statistics for many nationalities are available—hence the choice of that year as the division point.

#### I. 1851-1860

The European immigration into the United States during this decade presents a striking feature, the explanation of which must be sought in the events which occurred in the previous decade. Reference is to the fact that of the 2,598,000 who entered the country during this period of ten years, 1,750,000 came in the first half of the decade, while only 848,000 arrived in the last five years.<sup>1</sup>

As was stated in the previous chapter, the revolutionary wave which swept over Europe in 1848 had a widespread effect. Naturally the full force of the movement of peoples would not be felt until the issue had been decided, and hence the great increase in immigration into America was not so apparent until the first years of the fifties. France during this decade sent about the same number as she had in the previous ten years; Germany contributed to American immigration more than twofold the number she had sent in the forties; the Portuguese arrivals numbered three times those of the previous decade; and the Swiss immigration increased to over five times its previously highest figures. As for France, Germany, and Portugal, enough was said in the previous

<sup>1</sup> Immigration, stated in thousands, was as follows for each of the years of this decade:

1851	1852	1853	1854	1855	1856	1857	1858	1859	1860
379	371	368	427	200	200	251	123	121	153

Cf. *S. R. I.*, pp. 24 *seq.*

chapter to indicate the main causes for the increase. Mention need merely be made of the *coup d'état* of Louis Napoleon in 1851, the confiscation of the property of the Orleans family in 1852, and the inauguration of the second empire in the same year with Napoleon III as emperor.

In the case of Switzerland attention may be called chiefly to religious conditions in the previous decade as the causes contributing especially to the increase. In 1841 the religious peace of the country had been disturbed by the action of the Protestants in suppressing most of the monasteries in the canton of Aargau, and by attacks on this same canton in 1844 when it admitted the Jesuits into its territory. As a consequence, the Catholics formed a league known as the Sonderbund, and Protestant resentment against this act led to civil war (the Sonderbund War). The war ended in the defeat of the Catholics in 1847 and the expulsion of the Jesuits from the country as already recorded. To just what extent these conditions tended to increase immigration into the United States is somewhat problematical, but it may be surmised that it helped considerably to swell the number who entered this country during the decade.

English, Scottish, and Irish immigration also increased appreciably during the period. A general cause which may be cited in this case was the Crimean War and the general imperialistic operations of Great Britain, while more specifically the economic conditions respectively present in the three countries exerted such pressure on the populations that increased emigration from these nations was but natural. In 1853 England, watchful of any nation that might show a growth threatening a dangerous rivalry to English trade, injected herself into the hostilities which resulted from Russia's demand on Turkey that the Greek Christians in the latter country be placed under a Russian protectorate. With the aid of the French it was England's aim to see to it that the Moslem Turk should issue triumphant from the struggle, lest the "balance of power" be disturbed. This led to the Crimean War (1854-1856), in which England and France were arrayed against Russia, while Italy (Cavour in his plans for unification, being anxious for recognition of his movement) joined the allies in 1855. The war ended in 1856 with the defeat of Russia. In the latter year Great Britain was prosecuting her second war against China; in 1857 she brought her war with Persia to a close, and in the same year had to cope with the Sepoy Mutiny in India. As a consequence of these activities taxes in Great Britain mounted, and remembering the farm-consolidation movement and its effects<sup>2</sup> one need not be surprised to learn that American immigration from England increased by 122,000 during this decade. At the

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Chap. V.

same time the practise in Scotland of subdividing the crofts to such an extent that the small farms resulting were soon inadequate for the support of a family goes far to explain the increase in Scottish immigration from 3,700 to 38,000.

In Ireland the effects of the famine were still bearing fruit. Not to discuss again in this connection the physical effects apparent in the weakening of the constitutions of the Irish populace with its train of suffering and disease, it suffices to refer only to the iniquitous "quarter-acre act." This heartless measure, purposely designed to despoil the stricken population, so far as possible, of their few remaining possessions, denied famine relief to any person in possession of more than a quarter of an acre of land. Ireland being chiefly an agricultural country, the consequence was that the poor victims were either forced to dispose of their holdings and emigrate, or dispose of their land (except the quarter-acre, so utterly inadequate to support a family), receive their dole of relief, and finally, by force of circumstances, emigrate also. Hence, despite the fact that in 1853, 1855, and 1858 a good yield of potatoes was obtained, 914,000 Irish entered the United States during the decade.

Finally it may be mentioned that Italian immigration with a total for the decade of 9,231, first approached the 10,000 mark (it having been only 1,870 in the previous decade). The increase is probably due to the preliminary activities of the movement toward unification—the year of Garibaldi's marked successes was 1860—and the influence of the previous immigrants who by their reports to their friends in Italy incited others to follow them.

In the United States conditions were again, with the exception of the year 1859, conducive to a large immigration. As stated previously the discovery of gold in California attracted a large number of settlers to the West. Naturally the movement was not confined to the year 1849 but continued throughout the decade so that the population of California alone increased from 92,000 in 1850 to 380,000 in 1860.<sup>3</sup> The direct result was the opening of new opportunities both in the West and in the East. Despite the constantly increasing tension of the sectional feeling between the North and the South, the period was one of marked business activity and prosperity. The year 1853 witnessed the first American "World's Fair," held in New York City, while in the same year the first railroad west of the Mississippi was built. The annual excess of exports over imports nearly tripled between 1846 and 1857 (increase from \$16,000,000 to \$40,000,000), American shipping was prosperous, and the mileage of the railroads was increasing in an unprecedented manner.

However, the expansion had been too rapid and an initial fail-

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *A. T. C.*, p. 24.

ure in Cincinnati precipitated a financial panic in 1857, which was probably due chiefly to overspeculation induced by the gold production in California. As a result the immigration of 1858 fell to less than one half that of the previous year and although the business recovery was rapid, owing to abundant crops, the annual immigration remained until the close of the Civil War below 200,000, it being only 92,000 in 1861.

Although it was during this decade that the Know-Nothing party—the slogan of which was “America for Americans”—flourished, it is doubtful if its activities had any great effect in deterring foreigners from coming to America. Despite this tendency, so general among the people, to show hostility to foreigners, it was during this very period (in 1853) that the American Government defended against Austria, and established as a recognized principle, the right of foreign-born immigrants to give up allegiance to their native country and become citizens of the United States.

The total immigration during the decade was 2,598,214, the details in regard to which appear in the following table. Statistics on the foreign-born increase are here presented for the first time.

TABLE XXIII

*Total Immigration, net Catholic Immigration, and foreign-born Increase, 1851-1860, and Foreign Born, 1860, by Nationality*

	Per Cent Cath.	Total Imm.	For. Born 1860	For. Born Increase	Net Cath. Imm.
Austria-Hungary .	67.	.....	25,061	24,115	0
Belgium .....	95.	4,738	9,072	7,759	3,826
Denmark .....	.05	3,749	9,962	8,124	5
France .....	90.	76,358	109,870	55,801	58,414
Germany .....	32.	951,667	1,276,075	692,301	244,887
Greece .....	.10	33	328	242	0
Italy .....	90.	9,231	11,677	7,998	7,061
Netherlands .....	35.	10,789	28,281	18,433	3,209
Norway & Sweden	.01	20,931	62,620	46,383	4
Poland .....	75.	1,269	7,398	.....	804
Portugal .....	90.	1,055	4,116	2,842	2,500
Russia .....	5.	352	2,160	1,746	85
Spain .....	90.	9,298	4,244	1,131	5,150
Sweden .....	.01	....	(18,625)	(15,066)	...
Switzerland .....	35.	25,011	53,327	39,969	13,989
England & Wales..	3.	385,643	479,257	170,714	5,000
Ireland .....	77.6	914,119	1,611,304	694,585	602,000
Scotland .....	3.	38,331	108,518	37,968	977
Canada .....	25.	59,309	249,970	102,259	25,000
Mexico .....	90.	3,078	27,466	14,149	10,000
All other .....	10.	83,243 <sup>4</sup>	57,091	12,476	2,246
Total.....		2,598,214	4,138,697	1,894,095	985,157

<sup>4</sup>Of the 83,243 “all other,” 41,397 were Chinese. Cf. *S. A. U. S.*, p. 101.

According to the foregoing table the net Catholic immigration of the decade was practically 1,000,000 or nearly one half of the net total immigration of 2,208,000. Some apparent anomalies in the individual statistics are easily explained. The number of persons born in Austria-Hungary increased by 24,000, yet no total immigration nor net Catholic immigration is listed in their case. The reason is that such Catholic gain is included among those from Germany, with whom the Austrians and Hungarians were classed when entering this country. Yet the Catholic percentage of German immigrants is not increased, because the number of Austrians and Hungarians among them was small and because furthermore there was a large number of Jews<sup>5</sup> and radicals present in the German immigration during these years, and this tended to lower the usual Catholic percentage. In a similar way the large increase in foreign born from Belgium and the Netherlands, when compared with the comparatively small immigration from those countries, is accounted for by the fact that when entering they were undoubtedly listed as from France, which conversely accordingly lists a large immigration and a lesser increase in its nationals here, and any extra immigration of Dutch and Belgian Catholics over and above that listed is taken care of by basing the net French gain on the total French immigration.<sup>6</sup>

Immigrants from Spain and Portugal were considered together in computing the gain from these two sources and consequently a gain of 2,500 Portuguese Catholics is listed, against a total Portuguese immigration of 1,055, while the gain in Spanish Catholics is consequently diminished—probably not to as great a degree as should be when the Catholic gain of 5,000 is compared with the Spanish-born gain of only 1,131. In the case of the Swiss a very large gain in the number of Catholics is listed, based on the increase in the number of those born in Switzerland. Justification is found in the fact that probably the percentage of Swiss Catholics was greater in the immigration than in the general Swiss population, owing to the religious difficulties related above. The Swiss not enumerated as Swiss immigrants probably came in from France. In estimating the Catholic increase among Canadians allowance is made for the fact, as disclosed by the increase in the Canadian born, that many came into the United States unenumerated, while the Mexican immigration is treated in the same way for exactly the same reason.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Wiernik, *History of the Jews in America*, p. 135.

<sup>6</sup> It is true, however, that in many cases, a large increase in foreign born is due to the tendency on the part of foreigners to report their children born in this country as foreign born. Cf. *Compendium of United States Census, 1850*, p. 119.

In computing the gain in Irish Catholics the number is found to be practically the same, whether computed on the regular fifteen-per-cent-deduction method utilized in former decades or on a consideration of the increase in the number of those born in Ireland.<sup>7</sup>

While this large Catholic immigration was entering the country it was greeted generally by a growing hostility to foreigners and to Catholics (really to foreign Catholics, and more especially those of the Irish race), which crystallized in the infamous Know-Nothing movement. Aroused by the slogan of "America for Americans" (or more correctly "America for American Protestants"), it flourished from 1851 to 1858 when it died from anemia and inanition after having failed to elect, in 1856, its presidential candidate, Fillmore, who as vice-president had succeeded to the presidency on the death of Pres. Zachary Taylor in 1850. Formally organized in 1852 in New York, it spread rapidly throughout the country by appealing everywhere to the rabble through the medium of religious prejudice, calumnies, and lies. It met with success in municipal elections in New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, and San Francisco; sent forty representatives to Congress in 1854 and elected its candidate as governor of Massachusetts in that year; and in the following year won the gubernatorial elections in New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Rhode Island and had seventy-five members, recognized as such, in Congress.

Its spirit was manifest throughout the country in bigoted persecution of Catholic pupils in the public schools, and of Catholic inmates of asylums and poorhouses; in "Nunnery inspection" laws, and in open mob violence in which churches were wrecked and burned and Catholics assaulted and murdered. In Massachusetts a "Nunnery Inspection" law was enacted and put into execution while a similar law was proposed in Maryland but failed to pass. In some instances hampering property laws were enacted. Catholic pupils were punished and expelled from public schools in many places for refusal to read and study the Protestant New Testament or the Protestant form of the ten commandments, and Catholic children in orphan asylums, were in many cases brought up as Protestants. Riots, mob violence, terrorism and in most cases destruction of Catholic churches occurred in Providence,

<sup>7</sup> Of the 961,719 Irish born present in the country in 1850 it may be estimated that one-eighth died during the decade, leaving a total of 841,504 survivors in 1860. Subtracting this number from the total Irish born of 1860 (1,611,304) indicates a net Irish immigration of 770,000 during the period (over and above the deaths in the current immigration, and the emigration of all irrespective of date of entrance into the country). The Catholics among this number would amount to 597,000. The 15-per-cent deduction method records a net Catholic Irish gain of 602,000.

Boston, Dorchester, Roxbury, Charlestown, Lawrence, Chelsea, Manchester, Bath, Ellsworth, Me., Norwalk, Brooklyn, Saugerties, Palmyra, Sidney, Ohio, and Massillon, Ohio, and Galveston, Tex., while election day in August, 1855, is still known in Louisville, Ky., as "Bloody Monday" because of the violence and bloodshed attending the Know-Nothing demonstration on that day there.

Especially petty and bitter was the treatment accorded Archbishop Bedini when in 1853 he visited the United States as personal representative of the Pope. Refused any official recognition by the Government at Washington, to whom he presented credentials, he started on a tour of the dioceses of the country. A rabid outcry was raised against him by the Know-Nothing party and by certain Catholics, unworthy of the name, who resented the attempted intervention of the Pope's legate in ecclesiastical troubles disturbing the Church in Philadelphia and Buffalo. In practically all the cities which he visited—notably Boston, Baltimore, Wheeling, St. Louis, Cincinnati—vicious attacks were made on him by the Native Americanists, and in the last-named city the demonstration went so far as to result in an organized mob moving on the cathedral with, it was hinted, the intention of burning the edifice and hanging the papal nuncio. Happily the mob was dispersed by the police with little bloodshed.

There was a brighter side to the political outlook, however, manifested by the action of the Government in withdrawing restrictions on Catholic cadets at Annapolis, thereby enabling them to attend Mass on Sundays, a privilege formerly denied them. During this decade, too, occurred the famous Teeling case in Richmond, Va., the action of the court guaranteeing to Catholic priests exemption from examination, or obligation to testify, in regard to information learned through confession.

The accession of converts during the decade was notable, probably due as well to the backfiring of the Know-Nothing attacks as to the effect of the Oxford movement. Worthy of more than passing mention were the conversions of Dr. Levi S. Ives, Episcopal bishop of North Carolina, and of G. H. Doane, son of the Protestant Episcopal bishop of New Jersey, who later became a priest. Many Protestant ministers were also converted to the true faith, while of persons prominent in the political arena, Stephen A. Douglas, Democratic presidential candidate in 1860, died a Catholic in 1861. Two of the bishops appointed during the decade—Josue M. Young, second bishop of Erie, a typical New Englander, and James Roosevelt Bayley, first bishop of Newark, a relative of Mother Seton, and of the family which later numbered Theodore Roosevelt among its members—were converts.

During the decade the Church had successfully weathered the storm of bigotry and persecution, and had expanded its organization to meet the new needs created. The year 1853, following the first Plenary Council of Baltimore (1852) when recommendations were made to Rome in regard to appointments, was the season of greatest activity in this line. In this year, in the East, the sees of Brooklyn, Burlington, Newark and Portland were established; in the borderland on the approach to the West, Erie and Covington were made sees; in the Middle West, Quincy (translated to Alton in 1857, and to Springfield, Ill., in 1924) and Natchitoches (translated to Alexandria in 1910) were established as diocesan sees; and in the Far West, San Francisco, without having first been a diocese or vicariate, was erected a metropolitan see. In 1857 two more sees were added: Ft. Wayne, and Sault Ste. Marie, the latter (now known as Marquette) having been made a vicariate apostolic in 1853. Three other vicariates also had been established during the decade: one in 1851 embracing the territory of the present states of the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, Montana, Wyoming and Colorado, from which in 1859 was cut off the vicariate of Nebraska, with headquarters at Omaha; and a third in 1857 known as the vicariate of Florida, with headquarters at St. Augustine.

The greatest national development during the period had been toward the West,<sup>8</sup> but the reason why even more Western sees were not established during this decade is that many had already been erected in previous years in anticipation of this western development. The Church in the United States now consisted of a total of forty-three sees (seven archdioceses and thirty-six dioceses) and three vicariates, a gain of eleven sees and three vicariates during the decade.

As indicative of the growing strength and unity of the American Church attention may be called to four important events which occurred during this period. The year 1852 witnessed the first Plenary Council of Baltimore, at which the bonds of union between the various dioceses were knitted closer and much salutary and wholesome legislation enacted. In 1859 the American College, an institution for the training of American young men for the priesthood, under conditions which would make available to them the treasures of the Eternal City and direct contact with Roman traditions and atmosphere, was auspiciously opened. In the same year the first American religious community of men was established, when Fr. Hecker, a convert to the faith and a member of the Redemptorist order, organized, with several associates, the Paulists, whose chief aim was to carry

<sup>8</sup> The center of population moved 80.5 miles westward during these ten years. Cf. *A. T. C.*, p. 30.

the message of the true religion to the non-Catholics of America. An evidence of the growth in spirituality was the successful introduction of the Devotion of the Forty Hours Adoration. Progress was apparent everywhere, few internal dissensions blocked the path to peace, trusteeism was nearly dead, schools and academies were multiplying, Catholic education was improving, and the outlook for the future was bright.

The rate of natural increase during the decade was thirty per cent, indicating a gain of 482,000 Catholics through this source. The number of conversions may be estimated at 30,000 on a basis of an average of 2,000 priests during the decade, the number of priests having risen from 1,800 to 2,235 in the period.<sup>9</sup>

The total gain in Catholic membership between 1850 and 1860, when the immigration of 985,000 is combined with the two factors mentioned above, is found to be 1,497,000, and the total membership in 1860 was accordingly 3,103,000. Expressed in percentage the gain was nearly one hundred per cent, the population having almost doubled during the decade.

A summary of the decade appears in the following table:

TABLE XXIV

Summary, 1851-1860.

U. S. white, 1850.....	19,553,068	Cath. pop., 1850.....	1,606,000
Immigration .....	2,598,214	Cath. imm. inc.....	985,000
Increase by imm.....	2,208,000	Cath. natural inc.....	482,000
Foreign born, 1860.....	4,138,697	Conversions .....	30,000
U. S. white, 1860.....	26,922,537	Cath. pop., 1860.....	3,103,000

Little need be said in comparing the 1860 estimate with that given in Murray's statistical table<sup>10</sup> according to which an 1860 population of 4,500,000 is recorded. This table, however, records a gain of only 1,000,000 (3,500,000 is stated by it as the 1850 figure), whereas statistics adduced in the present chapter indicate a gain of practically 1,500,000. Without attacking again the

<sup>9</sup> New territory was added in the shape of the Gadsden Purchase of 1853, but it could not have contributed any appreciable addition to the Catholic membership, any such addition that occurred surely being allowed for in the rather generous estimates of the three other factors. The Gadsden Purchase became a part of New Mexico territory (Cf. *C. P. G.*, p. 53) and the population of this territory increased only 21,000 during the decade (from 61,000 to 82,000; cf. *Negro Population*, p. 44). The actual territorial population increase was, accordingly, certainly negligible as the 21,000 gain must be attributed chiefly to natural increase among the 61,000 of 1850. On the other hand, if it was really territorial increase, it was offset by a departure among the previous residents, so that in either case the result is the same.

<sup>10</sup> Murray, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*; Shea, *op. cit.*, vol. IV, p. 715, estimates the 1866 membership at 3,842,000.

1850 estimate of 3,500,000<sup>11</sup> it is sufficient to point out the unscientific character in which the gain of 1,000,000 is recorded. On a base of 3,500,000 the natural increase alone would have amounted (at a rate of thirty per cent) to 1,050,000. Such being the case, not even the full natural increase is allowed for, and absolutely no account is then taken of conversion and immigration; or if the two latter are accounted for, nothing is allowed for natural increase. I would, in conclusion, simply call attention to the fact that such statistics as are found in Murray's table, relating to Catholic population, are essentially unreliable (no true mathematical computation being attempted) and therefore cannot constitute a valid objection to the acceptability of the estimate reached in the present chapter.

## II. 1861-1870

The decade of the American Civil War, with its four years of bitter struggle, strangely enough witnessed an immigration which lacked only 284,000 of equalling the high mark reached in the previous decade. Of the 2,314,824 who entered the country, 801,723 came during the first five years and 1,513,101 during the last five. The reason for the difference in distribution is chiefly the fact that the Civil War, while it raged, tended greatly to discourage immigration. On the other hand, recovery after the war was so rapid and conditions in Europe were so conducive to emigration that once peace was restored in America the immigrant-receiving stations were kept busy caring for the crowds that knocked at our gates.

Immigration having its origin in Germany continued large owing to political conditions gradually converging toward the unification of Germany. This movement, started by Napoleon when he formed the Confederation of the Rhine, had been furthered by the Congress of Vienna which established the German Confederation, of which Prussia and Austria were the leaders. Jealousy and antagonism between the two leaders finally culminated in the Austro-Prussian or Seven Weeks' War (1866) the result of which was the exclusion of Austria from the confederation and the formation in 1867 of the North German Confederation, the latter paving the way for the establishment of the empire four years later. The Seven Weeks' War had been preceded in 1864, by the Schleswig-Holstein War between Denmark on the one side and Austria and Prussia on the other, Denmark being completely defeated, the division of the spoils being one

<sup>11</sup> For discussion on this point the reader is referred to the remarks following Table XXII.

of the contributory causes of the Austro-Prussian War. This victory, together with the later split between Prussia and Austria, and the unification of northern Germany, had not, however, been accomplished without cost to the German people. The echoes of the revolutionary days of 1848 were yet reverberating when in 1862 the Prussian parliament, resenting the imperialistic and militaristic policy of William I, refused to appropriate any funds for military purposes. Bismarck, thereupon called to the post of prime minister, proceeded to ignore the wishes of the parliament and reorganized the army by great expenditures and by a stricter system of military service. The direct results of the events and circumstances narrated can be almost mathematically calculated in their effect on immigration into the United States during the various years of this decade.

Leaving out of consideration the effects of the American Civil War, immigration from Germany was nominal in 1861, 1862 and 1863. In the two following years it increased considerably as the result of Bismarck's policy. The increase in 1866 and 1867 (not wholly due to the fact that the Civil War had ceased, as the 1868 immigration proves) continued noticeable, coinciding with the continued military policy and the war with Austria. In 1868 it dropped nearly to one-third the amount of 1867, the German people evidently expecting a period of peace and a subsidence of militarism. The next two years, however, witnessed Germany's preparation for the war with France—preparations which the people felt at least, if they did not understand them—and immigration again increased.<sup>12</sup>.

The events narrated in the preceding paragraphs had also, in all probability, two other direct results. The immigration from Denmark, recorded as 3,700 in the preceding decade, increased to 17,000 during the present period. The large increase in Austrian immigration was also due partly to the course of events narrated above, although in this case there were internal causes, the force of which will be brought out more fully in the treatment of the following decade.

French immigration decreased by one half during the decade, owing to the enlightened policy which Napoleon III pursued during these years in a vain effort to conciliate the two chief parties opposing him—the Catholic party and labor. These two he had almost completely alienated by his course in the previous decade—

<sup>12</sup> German immigration into the United States for each year of the decade was as follows:

1861	1862	1863	1864	1865	1866	1867	1868	1869	1870
31,661	27,539	33,162	57,276	83,424	115,892	133,426	55,831	131,042	118,225

Cf. *S. R. I.*, pp. 24-30.

the former by his attitude toward the papal temporal power, the latter by his restoration of absolute rule and withdrawal of the privileges which the people had acquired through the revolution of 1848.

The fruitless insurrection of the Poles against their Russian oppressors in 1863 had no direct appreciable result on American immigration during the decade, the same being true of revolutionary risings in Spain.

In the case of Ireland, the Fenian uprising tended probably as much as the chief external cause, the Civil War, to retard emigration to the United States. The agrarian troubles in Ireland, always acute, but especially so since the famine, had reached such a stage that the movement against the brutal landlords assumed the form of an attempted national uprising, having as its avowed purpose the shaking off of the British yoke. This movement of the Fenians, as the association which furthered it came to be known, was an ill-fated one. In Ireland it was finally suppressed in 1867 after some years of conflict with the Crown. In America some unsuccessful attempts were made by members of the Fenian society to invade Canada. The definite abandonment of the movement may be said to date from 1870. Two important events followed the Fenian troubles—whether the result of the movement or due to other causes, as some claim, it is impossible to say. In 1869 the Irish (Protestant) Church was disestablished, the chief effect of this act for the Irish people being the consequence that no longer would poor Catholics be mulcted to maintain Protestant clergymen in luxury and idleness. Though the act was passed in 1869 it provided that it was to go into effect only in 1871. In 1870 the first Irish Land Act was passed, truly a sorry measure in view of the existing evils, but yet giving some slight relief at least to the oppressed tenants. The potato crop was poor in 1861 and 1862, but good in 1864. The net result of all the factors affecting emigration was that the movement from Ireland to the United States during the decade was less than one half that of the preceding decade.

In the United States, as pointed out, the Civil War greatly discouraged immigration. However, after it had been waged for four years, from 1861 to 1865, the declaration of peace gave a new impetus to immigration. In the North recovery was rapid. In the South, since it had been the scene of the conflict, the traces of the struggle were only gradually obliterated although the political reorganization was completed in 1870. American industrial and commercial progress was marked during the reconstruction period. In 1866 the first trans-Atlantic cable, connecting Europe with America was laid, and in 1869 the first railroad to the Pacific coast, later known as the Union Pacific, was completed,

while between 1865 and 1872 over 30,000 miles of railroad were laid. The result of the development from a commercial standpoint was that New York, and the East in general, had been brought into close touch with the West. Commercially China was now only one month distant from New York, while in the other direction the cable greatly facilitated commerce with Europe. From a more particularly industrial point of view the completion of the transcontinental railroad meant the opening up of the vast central region to settlement and development.

Immigration and foreign-born statistics are set forth in the following table:

TABLE XXV

*Total Immigration, net Catholic Immigration, and foreign-born Increase, 1861-1870, and Foreign Born, 1870, by Nationality*

	Per Cent Cath.	Total Imm.	For. Born 1870	For. Born Increase	Net Cath. Imm.
Austria-Hungary .	67.	7,800	74,534	45,736	31,000
Belgium .....	95.	6,734	12,553	3,481	3,800
Denmark .....	.11	17,094	30,107	20,145	20
France .....	90.	35,984	116,402	6,532	14,400
Germany .....	35.	787,468	1,690,533	413,458	210,000
Greece .....	.5	72	390	62	0
Italy .....	90.	11,728	17,212	5,535	6,000
Netherlands .....	35.	9,102	46,802	18,521	6,000
Norway .....	.016	71,630	114,246	70,251	10
Poland .....	75.	2,024	14,436	7,138	6,000
Portugal .....	90.	2,658	4,542	426	900
Russia .....	7.5	2,512	4,644	1,484	100
Spain .....	90.	5,835	3,841	— 403 <sup>13</sup>	0
Sweden .....	.012	27,668	97,332	78,707	10
Switzerland .....	40.	23,286	75,153	21,826	9,000
England & Wales.	4.	568,128	629,579	150,322	5,000
Ireland .....	76.6	435,778	1,855,827	244,523	371,000
Scotland .....	4.	38,768	140,835	32,317	1,500
Canada .....	25.	153,871	493,464	243,494	60,000
Mexico .....	90.	2,191	42,435	14,969	14,000
All other .....	10.	94,493 <sup>14</sup>	102,364	48,202	2,600
Total.....		2,314,824	5,567,229	1,428,532	741,340

According to the preceding table the increase in Catholic membership during the decade was almost three-quarters of a million out of a total net immigration of about 1,800,000. The Catholic proportion in this decade was smaller than in the previous period owing chiefly to the decrease in Irish immigration and the increase in arrivals from England and Wales, Norway and Sweden, and Denmark, and the continued large immigration from Germany.

<sup>13</sup> Decrease.

<sup>14</sup> 64,301 of these were Chinese. Cf. *S. A. U. S.*, p. 101.

In several cases the net Catholic immigration has been computed through the statistics on foreign born rather than by the straight immigration-emigration method. Thus in the case of natives of Austria-Hungary a Catholic gain of 31,000 is recorded, while an immigration of only 7,800 is listed. In the same manner a Catholic gain of 6,000 Polish contrasts with an immigration of only 2,024 of that nationality. Offsetting this it will be found that the increase of German Catholics allows for the fact, disclosed by a study of the growth of German born, that many of those listed in this decade as German immigrants really originated elsewhere—in all probability in Austria-Hungary, Denmark, and Poland.<sup>15</sup>

In the case of French immigration the amount of Catholic gain is decreased by this method, while the gain in natives of the Netherlands (9,000 immigration—6,000 Catholic gain) is correspondingly increased.

Spanish immigration and emigration to and from the United States undoubtedly balanced during the decade. There was a net loss of 403 persons of Spanish birth between 1861 and 1870. The deaths among the 4,000 Spanish born of 1860 could not have numbered much more than 500 during the decade. If this had been the only factor operating, the 5,800 Spanish immigration should then have recorded a gain of 4,700 (allowing for 580 deaths among the current immigration). The fact that instead of a gain there was a loss can be explained only by positing that 4,700 (the amount that should have been gained) plus 403 (the net loss) emigrated. Actually the Church probably lost a few members rather than breaking even in this exchange.

Mexican membership on the other hand shows a gain of 14,000 as against a recorded immigration through this source of only 2,000. In the same way, through the entrance of persons who were not recorded by the immigration bureau, the number of Canadian born increased much more than the decadal immigration listed, and a proportionate gain in Catholic membership is also assumed.

In the case of the Irish a study of statistics for Irish born discloses the probability that about 150,000 Irish entered the United States from other countries than Ireland, making the total Irish immigration much higher than that recorded.<sup>16</sup> A similar study of the English born reveals that many of these 150,000 must have

<sup>15</sup> Poland not being recognized as a nation, naturally persons of Polish birth are often recorded as of other nationalities.

<sup>16</sup> A gain of 371,000 Irish Catholics (as is listed in Table XXV) requires a basis of 578,000 immigrants, if computed by the regular immigration-emigration method. The recorded Irish immigration during the decade was 435,000.

come from England,<sup>17</sup> while some probably came from Canada. How many from each we can not say.

The category "all other" shows a small Catholic gain owing to the fact that 64,000 of these immigrants were Chinese.

The story of the American Church during the decade is a varied one: a record of wise and patriotic action by hierarchy and people both in the North and in the South, of heroic self-sacrifice and service, contrasting with unbelievably ungrateful persecution, especially on the part of the Union Government; a trail of ruined churches and schools in the South; a slow and difficult recovery in the southern states after the war; a surprising growth and progress in other sections even while hostilities raged, and a marked development following the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore which took place in 1866.

The story of prudent, pastoral guidance of the Church by the bishops throughout America during the trying days of internecine strife is one that has often been told. While counselling and praying for peace, the hierarchy manfully extolled the virtue of patriotism, and Catholics were found in large numbers on both sides heroically performing their duty. Priests and Sisters in sublime self-sacrifice ministered to the soldiers, even on the battle-field, in spiritual and corporeal works of mercy.<sup>18</sup> As an instance of the unprecedented participation of Sisters in this work it is recorded that in one day (July 20, 1862) thirty-four Sisters of Charity left Baltimore to labor among the soldiers in McClellan's army, while nearly fifty more were sent to other points, and in the next year sixty Sisters of Charity were sent from Baltimore to attend the hospitals in and around Washington, and others were summoned to Baltimore from various points to take charge of the military hospital there.<sup>19</sup>

However, even in the presence of such universal evidence of Catholic patriotism, bigotry did not hesitate to advance its usual claims. On the very floor of Congress the Catholic chaplains were calumniously attacked. In many localities provost marshals took it upon themselves to visit Catholic educational institutions to

<sup>17</sup> It is also evident that there was a large return movement—probably 200,000 or more—to England during this decade, a not improbable supposition, for during the next decade official statistics record that the return movement amounted to 61 per cent of the total immigration from England. Cf. Table IX.

<sup>18</sup> Tardy recognition of the heroic work of the Sisters has been made by a recent act of Congress, authorizing the erection of a monument to perpetuate the memory of those who labored on behalf of the soldiers during the war. This monument to "The Nuns of the Battlefield" was presented to the nation by the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians. Erected on Government ground in Washington, D. C., it was unveiled at the Holy Name Society Convention, in September, 1924.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Shea, *op. cit.*, vol. IV, pp. 388, 389.

exact an oath of allegiance from the children whose fathers and brothers were under arms at the front. In 1862 an objectionable test-oath act, aimed at the priesthood, was passed in Kentucky; in 1864 the necessity of taking a similar oath prevented the meeting of any synod or convention of priests in St. Louis, and in 1865 the Drake Constitution in Missouri, imposing an objectionable oath on ministers of the gospel before they would be allowed to act as such, led to the arrest of many priests who refused to submit to such an iniquitous law. Though declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, the act continued for some time to serve as a pretext for persecuting priests and in some cases even Sisters. The climax was reached after the assassination of President Lincoln, when the Catholics of lower Maryland were charged with the responsibility for the crime. The absurd statement that Booth, the assassin, was a Jesuit, was widely circulated and actually believed; and the unfortunate Mrs. Surratt was sacrificed to appease the popular outcry. So, at least, present-day evidence seems to indicate.

Despite the clamor of the persecutors, however, the Church gained wonderfully in prestige by the example which she set, chiefly through what was to non-Catholics her inexplicable failure to split over the political questions which divided so many other churches. During part of this period and for many years previously, the office of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States was held by a Catholic, Roger Taney, and in 1861 when the Union Government feared that European recognition of the Confederacy was impending, it was no less a personage than Archbishop Hughes of New York who was chosen by the Government as envoy to approach the European powers to avert that action.

In the South, in the localities which were the scene of the conflict, the chief damage suffered by the Church was due to the fortunes of war, although in some cases bigotry also seized the opportunity to work unhampered under cover of wartime exigencies. It would be tedious to recount in detail the effect of the war upon the Church. In Virginia, for example, United States provost marshals practically took charge of the churches in many places, and attempted to prescribe the form of worship to be followed. The safety of Bishop Whelan of Wheeling was menaced; Bishop Elder of Natchez was expelled from his diocese for not complying with unjust demands made upon him; in many places priests were arrested and Sisters were driven from their homes. In other ways, both from a spiritual and material point of view, the loss was a terrible one. Churches were seized for stables and warehouses, colleges were turned into hospitals, and the blackened ruins of many an ecclesiastical edifice, from Charles-

ton to Pensacola and Chattanooga, testified at the end of the war to the fury and the wanton destruction of the struggle.

Under conditions such as portrayed, it can be easily understood that the Church in the South had been set back possibly a generation by the Civil War. It is hard to say whether she actually lost members or not during the decade, but the material problem alone which confronted her after the war was a heart-breaking one, and one most difficult to cope with. The only hierarchical development to be noted in the South during the decade is the establishment of the vicariate apostolic of North Carolina in 1868 and the raising of the vicariate of Florida to the see of St. Augustine in 1870.

In 1866 the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore convened, and as a result of the representations made to Rome, many new dioceses and vicariates, including the two already mentioned, were established. In the East, in 1868, Harrisburg, Rochester, Scranton and Wilmington were erected, and in 1870 Springfield (Mass.) became a see. In the Middle West, also in 1868, the dioceses of Columbus, Green Bay, La Crosse and St. Joseph were erected, and in the West in the same year the vicariates apostolic of Boise, Denver, and Tucson were established and the vicariate of Marysville (erected 1861) became the diocese of Grass Valley. Consequently a net gain of eleven dioceses and three vicariates apostolic is recorded during the decade, there being in 1870 fifty-four sees (of which seven were archdioceses) and six vicariates.

The rate of natural increase during the decade was somewhat below twenty per cent—much lower than in previous decades owing to the increase in deaths and the decrease in births due to the war. Adopting twenty per cent as the rate, the natural increase among the Catholic population of 1860 amounted to 620,000 during the decade. The number of conversions is estimated at 40,000 for the period on a basis of 2,235 priests in 1860 and 3,780 in 1870. It must be remembered that many of the conversions of soldiers during the war did not constitute a gain to the Catholic membership since they were death-bed conversions. Adding to the above the net Catholic immigration of 741,000, the total Catholic membership in 1870 is found to be 4,504,000.

A summary of the decade appears in the following table:

TABLE XXVI  
*Summary, 1861-1870.*

U. S. white, 1860.....	26,922,537	Cath. pop., 1860.....	3,103,000
Immigration .....	2,314,824	Cath. imm. inc.....	741,000
Increase by imm.....	1,800,000	Cath. natural inc.....	620,000
Foreign born, 1870.....	5,567,229	Conversions .....	40,000
U. S. white, 1870.....	33,589,377	Cath. pop., 1870.....	4,504,000

To compare with the estimate presented in Table XXVI there is, practically in agreement, that of Gilmary Shea who estimated the Catholic population of 1866 at 3,842,000.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>20</sup> *Op. cit.*, vol. IV, p. 715.

## CHAPTER X

### CATHOLIC GROWTH FROM 1870 TO 1920.

During this period—the second half of the century of Catholic growth under discussion—statistics on emigration gradually become available; where they are not available, the methods so far employed will continue to be used in solving the problems presented.

#### I. 1871-1880

In the opening decade of this period appeared the first definite harbingers of that great flood of immigrants which were later to pour into the country from southern and eastern Europe. Austria, Italy, Russia registered a large increase in the number of their subjects entering the United States. Absolutely speaking, however, the actual gain was not large, and when the gain in immigration from the Catholic countries of Italy, Austria-Hungary, and France is compared with the increase from non-Catholic countries—Russia, Denmark, Norway and Sweden, Scotland, and Canada—the latter increase, even taking into account the slump in immigration from England, is about twice as large as the former. The “Catholic” immigration has not yet commenced.

The remote causes of the increase in the number of immigrants coming to the United States from Russia and Austria-Hungary were pointed out in a previous chapter.<sup>1</sup> Serfdom was abolished in Russia in 1861 but the method of carrying into effect the suppression of that institution was such that the condition of the unfortunate peasant was worse under the new régime than it had been under the old. To this fact must be attributed in great measure the success which the Nihilists had in inoculating the common people with their anarchistic and revolutionary doctrines.

In 1873 this movement took its rise, and when the Government retaliated with oppressive measures the Nihilists in turn resorted to violence, and after vain attempts in 1879 and 1880 they finally succeeded in assassinating the Czar, Alexander II. The further consequences of this act will be related in connection with the next decade, but it is quite plain that the general situation in Russia

<sup>1</sup> Chap. V.

was the chief cause of the present increase in Russian immigration into the United States.

In Austria something similar had also taken place. In 1848 the feudal land-tenure system had been abolished. Until 1869 the new peasant owners were forbidden to subdivide their holdings, but when in that year this restriction was withdrawn the result soon was that subdivision reached such a state that many of the holdings were insufficient to support the owners. This situation was the main cause of the beginnings of Austrian and Hungarian immigration into the United States. How far the political conditions of the dual monarchy contributed to the same result is problematical but it is unquestionable that they had some share in it. The heterogeneous character of the populations which combined to form the dual monarchy was so marked that national and racial animosities and jealousies have always been a characteristic of Austrian political life. Until 1867 the absolute rule of the emperor sought to hold the warring forces in check by sheer strength. However, after being defeated in 1859 by France and Italy and in 1866 by Prussia, the Government extended to the people the grant of a constitutional government and in 1867 the dual monarchy was established. It is in the racial difficulties which led to this establishment of a more democratic form of government, difficulties not entirely obviated by the change, that is to be found, outside of economic causes, the chief explanation for the constantly growing increase in the movement of nationals from Austria-Hungary to the United States. As for the religious situation in Austria at this time, it was, on the whole, probably better than it had been during the first half of the nineteenth century. The revolution of 1848 had resulted in breaking most of the bonds, relics of Josephism, which still fettered the Church. The Concordat of 1855 was short-lived, as the Government seized the pretext of the definition of papal infallibility to abrogate it in 1870. However, despite a growing anticlericalism, the religious situation as such can have had little, if any, influence on emigration.

This decade saw, too, the beginnings of the great rush of Italian immigrants to America. During this decade 56,000 entered our country, while during the previous ten years only 12,000 arrivals were registered. The explanation of this increase and of the continued growth of Italian immigration is found in the political events which marked the history of Italy at this time. The preliminary steps in the unification of Italy have, sufficiently for the present purpose, been already delineated. After the king of Sardinia had been proclaimed king of Italy in 1861 the one aim of the radical element in that country was the complete subjugation of the papal possessions.

Having acquired Venetia from Austria in 1866, Italy prepared to complete its plan of unification, and when in 1870 the Franco-Prussian War caused the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome, the Italian Government seized the Eternal City. The result of this train of events upon the Church was, of course, noticeably detrimental, although there were also some compensations; but, while religion suffered, emigration from Italy can hardly be traced to this phase of the movement. The real connection between the unification of Italy and the great emigration movement which almost immediately followed is found in a study of the economic results of this unification. Instead of a group of small states, each satisfied with simple governmental machinery and called upon to cope with but few problems of moment, now there existed a central, union, if not federal, Government; a Government which was preparing to occupy a place among the powers; a Government which if it was to enjoy the privileges of its new status must also assume the duties, the burdens and obligations of the same. The central Government, with its ramifying bureaus, its legislative bodies and their numerous appendages probably cost more than the individual Governments. Military service became a drain on the man power and the resources of the nation, burdensome taxation weighed heavily upon the common people, and since the country was largely lacking in developed natural resources which could have cared for the increased taxation, the peasantry in ever increasing numbers sought refuge in emigration.

The next important event in European affairs to which attention should be called is the Franco-Prussian War. The cause need not detain us; the results were widespread. The utter rout of the French in this war led to the overthrow of the Empire and the establishment of the Third Republic, while the fall of Paris led to the Commune, whereby the radicals in that city sought to gain control of the country. In a recrudescence of the spirit of 1789 the Church suffered a bloody, though brief, persecution in which, with many others, Archbishop Darboy lost his life. Under the new republic republicanism became identified, in the mind of most Catholics, with the anti-Catholic policy and tendencies of its lineal progenitor, the French Revolution. Conversely the Catholic was looked upon as hostile to the republican form of government and seeking to reinstate the monarchy. The result was that the Republic, almost immediately after its definitive establishment in 1875, inaugurated that long series of persecutory acts and laws which culminated in 1905 in the abrogation of the Concordat of 1801. The connection of this train of events with American immigration from France is slight, from a numerical point of view. The number of French immigrants during the present decade

(1871-1880) was twice that of the previous period, but, even so, it was only 72,000. The real effect on the American Church is found in the fact that particularly after the events of 1870 and 1901-1905 many French priests, especially members of religious orders, came to America to serve in the ranks in a country where the church is assured freedom of activity.

For Germany success in the war with France meant a change in government also. In 1871, previous to the signing of peace, the German Empire was proclaimed. The political unification of Germany was now completed. Bismarck, the iron chancellor, immediately turned his attention to the religious situation which he deemed of a seriously threatening nature since the Catholic Church, whose members, augmented by the accession of Alsace-Lorraine, numbered about one-third of the entire population, was not under State control. With the purpose of changing the situation he inaugurated the infamous *Kulturkampf*, which, as it turned out, was a providential blessing for the Church in Germany. The May laws of 1873 decreed the expulsion of the Jesuits and of certain other orders, placed under State control the training of candidates for the priesthood and the appointment of priests, and in many ways, especially through marriage legislation, hampered the free exercise of the Catholic religion. The result, however, was not what had been expected. Instead of tamely submitting, the Catholics rallied valiantly around their leader, Windthorst. It is unnecessary to dwell on Bismarck's "journey to Canossa." He had succeeded only in strengthening beyond all the hopes of the Church the Catholics of Germany. In the face of difficulties from other quarters, within a few years he felt compelled to capitulate to the Center. The Galilean had conquered once again. For America the result was the acquisition of German priests and Sisters, rather than any decided increased influx of the faithful from Germany, during the decade.

For Ireland the period was one of unrest and agitation. The evils of the land-tenure system were pressing heavily on the people and the "anti-rent" agitation sought to crystallize and unite Irish sentiment on the question. In 1870 Isaac Butt founded the Home Rule Party, and Charles Stewart Parnell soon thereafter took the helm. In 1879 was formed the Land League, which was upon its dissolution succeeded by the Irish National League. The British, however, soon found a pretext for putting on once more the screws of coercion and the Irish dream of success vanished. The agitation in Ireland probably tended to keep the Irish at home to join in the fight against England; economic pressure, however, forced many out of the country, and despite the American panic of 1873 the Irish immigration of this decade equalled that of the previous ten years.

In the United States the decade was for the most part a period of financial depression and labor troubles, factors which clearly retarded immigration. During and following the Franco-German war, which was, too, a period of poor harvests in Europe, American business flourished in an unprecedented manner. Speculation and railroad expansion continued; the rebuilding of Chicago and Boston, which had been almost destroyed by fire in 1871 and 1872 respectively, absorbed much money, and when a quarrel between the railroads and the western farmers stopped the sale of bonds, bankers were crippled and a first failure in 1873 was followed by the collapse and ruin of thousands of other business houses, the resultant distress continuing until 1879. In addition there occurred in 1877 a widespread railroad strike accompanied in some cities by serious riots. Despite these conditions immigration topped by a half million that of the previous decade, as the following table discloses:

TABLE XXVII

*Total Immigration, net Catholic Immigration, and foreign-born Increase, 1871-1880, and Foreign Born, 1880, by Nationality.*

	Per Cent Cath.	Total Imm.	For. Born 1880	For.-Born Increase	Net Cath. Imm.
Austria-Hungary .	67.	72,969	135,550	61,016	46,230
Belgium .....	95.	7,221	15,535	2,982	4,000
Denmark .....	.14	31,771	64,196	34,089	50
France .....	90.	72,206	106,971	— 9,431	4,000
Germany .....	35.9	718,182	1,966,742	276,209	175,000
Greece .....	.5	210	776	386	0
Italy .....	90.	55,759	44,535	27,323	27,000
Netherlands .....	35.	16,541	58,090	11,288	5,000
Norway .....	.02	95,333	181,729	67,483	10
Poland .....	75.	12,970	48,557	34,121	26,000
Portugal .....	90.	14,082	8,138	3,596	4,000
Russia .....	7.5	29,284	25,722	21,078	2,000
Spain .....	90.	5,266	5,288	1,447	2,000
Sweden .....	.014	115,912	194,337	97,005	20
Switzerland .....	40.	28,293	88,621	13,468	8,800
England & Wales..	4.4	460,479	747,462	117,883	8,000
Ireland .....	76.5	436,871	1,854,571	— 1,256*	180,000
Scotland .....	5.	87,564	170,136	29,301	3,000
Canada .....	30.	383,269	717,157	223,693	82,500
Mexico .....	90.	5,362	68,399	25,964	23,000
All other .....	10.	155,647 †	167,431	65,359	3,390
Total.....		2,812,191	6,679,943	1,112,714	604,000

\* Decrease.

† 123,000 Chinese. Cf. *S. A. U. S.*, p. 101.

It will be noticed that the Catholic immigration from Austria-Hungary, Poland and Mexico, as listed in the preceding table is

high when compared with the total immigration from these countries, actually exceeding it in the case of the two last named. The basis for such computation is the number of foreign born here at the beginning and the end of the decade. In the case of the Netherlands, Russia and Switzerland, the result is found to be the same when the computation is made by a study of the foreign born as when made by the immigration-emigration method. In the case of Belgium, France, Italy, Portugal, Spain and Canada, the figures for the foreign born disclose the fact that the emigration from the United States of natives of these countries was greater than the allowance of ten per cent applied in the immigration-emigration method. Thus the number of persons born in France and dwelling here actually decreased by over 9,000 during the decade.

For those of German nationality the net Catholic immigration is based on the supposition of a net total immigration of 486,000. Since the discrepancy between this and the listed total gross immigration of 718,000 may seem large, a brief explanation of the computation may be in order. This net immigration supposes an emigration from the United States of 232,000 Germans (including the usual allowance of five per cent for deaths among the current immigration).<sup>2</sup> This is thirty-two per cent of the total immigration. Deducting the deaths (five per cent) the emigration is found to be twenty-seven per cent of the immigration, not at all a high proportion in view of the fact that a severe financial panic held sway in the United States from 1873 to 1879, and in view of the statistics for Great Britain and Ireland, which disclose the fact that from 1876 to 1880 emigration of British and Irish from the United States amounted to fifty-six per cent of the immigration, while for the whole decade the proportion of all nationalities returning to the British Isles from this country was over sixty-one per cent of the number entering.<sup>3</sup>

The figures referred to in the previous sentence explain the procedure in the computation of the Irish and British Catholic immigration. The statistics quoted show that in the case of these nationalities a large number left the United States during the decade. The statistics do not, however, state how many of the 604,000 who left this country were Irish, how many British, and how many of other nationalities. A study of the foreign born gives evidence that about 200,000 were Irish and 300,000 British while about 100,000 were therefore of other nationalities. The

<sup>2</sup> Of the 1,690,000 Germans present in the country in 1870 about 200,000 must have died during the decade. The increase in the number of Germans was 276,000 for the decade. The current immigration, therefore, since it replaced the 200,000 deaths and added 276,000 to the total, must have amounted to about 476,000, to which are added 10,000 extra.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Table IX.

net Irish immigration was accordingly about 235,000 giving an increase of 180,000 Catholics.<sup>4</sup> The total Catholic immigrational increase for the decade is then 604,000.

In computing the natural increase among the Catholics of 1870 the rate is placed at twenty-four per cent somewhat higher than the general rate for the country, which was 22.5 per cent, after deduction is made for the immigrational increase, the total rate having been 29.2 per cent. Numerically, therefore, the Catholic natural increase amounted to 1,081,000. The conversions may be estimated at 70,000 on a basis of 3,780 priests in 1870 and 6,000 in 1880, the total Catholic population at the end of the decade being 6,259,000.

Progress in hierarchical development was consistent during this period. The time was propitious for the appointment of more metropolitan sees and accordingly in 1875 Boston, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, and Santa Fé, and in 1880 Chicago, became archdioceses. In this decade, too, the United States received her first Cardinal when in 1875 Archbishop McCloskey of New York was made a member of the Sacred College. Six new dioceses were erected: Ogdensburg and Providence in 1872; San Antonio in 1874; Leavenworth and Peoria in 1877; and Kansas City in 1880. In 1874 Corpus Christi was established as a vicariate apostolic. There were accordingly in 1880 a total of sixty dioceses, twelve of which were archdioceses, and six vicariates.

A summary of this decade appears in the following table.

TABLE XXVIII  
*Summary, 1871-1880.*

U. S. white, 1870..	33,589,377	Cath. pop. 1870....	4,504,000
Immigration .....	2,812,191	Cath. imm. inc.....	604,000
Increase by imm..	1,190,000	Cath. natural inc.	1,081,000
Foreign born, 1880.	6,679,943	Conversions .....	70,000
U. S. white, 1880..	43,402,970	Cath. pop. 1880....	6,259,000

<sup>4</sup> It is possible that so many Irish did not really emigrate from this country during the decade, and that the net immigration was actually greater than 235,000. The latter estimate is based on the supposition that there was about the normal number of deaths (twelve and one-half per cent) among the Irish born of 1870 during the decade. The number of Irish decreased by 1,256 during the period—in other words, the net immigration merely replaced the deaths (the latter being accounted for in computing the natural increase). Now if the deaths amounted to more than twelve and one-half per cent the net immigration was accordingly larger. On the other hand, too, if the deaths did amount to more than twelve and one-half per cent of the 1870 Irish-born population it was a disproportionate number indicating an undue loss of Catholics through this factor (hence not allowed for in the computation of the natural increase) and accordingly the real Irish Catholic gain would remain as computed in Table XXVII.

As compared with the foregoing estimate for 1880, that of Sadlier's Directory for the same year listed a Catholic population of slightly more than six and one-third millions.

## II. 1881-1890

The decade now to be considered witnessed a marked increase in immigration—an increase of almost one hundred per cent over the number who entered in the previous decade, the comparative figures being 2,812,000 for the previous decade and 5,246,000 for the present period. While there was a large increase in arrivals from the Catholic sections of Europe it is quite erroneous to hold, as many do, that the bulk of the total increase was from those sections. A comparative study of Tables XXVIII and XXIX discloses the fact that of the 2,434,000 *increase* in immigration during this decade 1,705,000 came from distinctively Protestant countries, while only 729,000 came from Catholic countries, there being actually a decrease in the number of immigrants from France, Spain and Portugal. The result is that the net Catholic immigration for the decade remains in about the usual proportion of approximately one-third of the total net immigration.

The most notable increase in immigration coming from Catholic countries occurred in the case of Austria-Hungary and Italy. Internal events in Austria-Hungary, and a study of statistics, indicate a strong probability that the proportion of Catholics among immigrants from that country was not as large as the proportion in the whole population. In 1878 the Congress of Berlin had placed the two Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina under Austrian control. Though these provinces were not made a part of Austria (they were not annexed until 1908), yet in 1881 the dual monarchy issued a decree subjecting their inhabitants to military service in the imperial army. An insurrection immediately broke out in Herzegovina, but was promptly suppressed, as was also another in Dalmatia. The dissatisfaction of the provinces undoubtedly had a great deal to do with the increase in emigration from the country, although, of course, the economic conditions, mentioned in a previous chapter, were also now beginning to make themselves felt more acutely. To what extent the clash of nationalities, the warring of languages, the contentions of religious parties—all so prevalent in the dual monarchy—affected emigration cannot be accurately estimated, but they, as well as economic causes, did operate. However, whatever the probabilities of an undue proportion of non-Catholics among the immigrants entering this country from Austria-Hungary, the usual Catholic

percentage is applied unchanged. Of the Italian immigration it need merely be noted that the economic results of the unification of Italy were beginning to be felt more and more. Nearly six times as many Italians entered the United States from 1881 to 1890 as did in the previous decade.

French immigration decreased appreciably although the decade witnessed in France a renewed anti-clerical outbreak. The Orleans and Bonaparte princes were expelled from the country in 1886; all Jesuit establishments were ordered dissolved in 1880 and all other non-authorized religious orders were commanded to submit their statutes to the government; a vigorous campaign of persecution was instituted through the department of education. The low birth rate prevented any great emigration out of France, but despite this fact, for America a notable result of the situation in France was the arrival here of many priests and sisters seeking refuge from the decrees levelled against them.

German and Russian immigration to the United States increased enormously during the decade. In Russia the economic results of the suppression of serfdom, and especially of the methods used in the suppression, continued. In addition there was also the reaction against liberalism in government caused by the assassination of Alexander II in 1881. Alexander III instituted an autocratic, despotic rule, characterized by the ill treatment accorded Catholics and Jews.<sup>5</sup> The resulting emigration was disproportionately Jewish as a consequence of the brutal measures applied to the Jews under various laws issued throughout this decade.<sup>6</sup>

The situation of the Jews in Germany was very similar. In 1880 a violent anti-Jewish agitation broke out in that country. The period was one of great industrial development. It was marked by the enactment of various laws for alleviating and improving the condition of the workingman. The Reichstag successively passed acts providing for the insurance of workingmen against accidents, against old age and infirmity. The Kulturkampf came to an end in 1887. Were it not for the Jewish situation, and for the movement looking toward the Germanization of Polish subjects one would logically conclude that there would be little if any German emigration during the decade. Yet German immigration into the United States more than doubled during the decade, so that Germany was the first nation to send us over one million immigrants in the space of ten years. It would be absurd to claim that all of these were Jews. There is no question, how-

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Chapter V.

<sup>6</sup> Exact statistics for this decade cannot be given, but in 1899, when immigration statistics were first recorded by race, the Russian immigrants were 39.8 per cent; and in 1904, 1905, and 1906 were over 50 per cent Jewish. Cf. *E. C. E.*, p. 272.

ever, but that a disproportionate number of them were, while of Socialists and radicals there were also included a great many.

For Ireland the years of this decade record the usual economic struggle. The land question and home rule were to the front. A sop had been handed to the Irish in the form of the first Irish Land Bill in 1870. The formation of the Irish Land League, its manifesto, the arrest of Parnell, in 1881, the founding of the Irish National League in 1882, are indications of the activities in Ireland during these years. In 1886 Gladstone's first Home Rule bill met defeat in Parliament, and in the same year a land-purchase act which he submitted for the benefit of Ireland also failed of acceptance. Unrest and agitation, poverty and hardship, and the partial failure of the potato crop in 1879, 1882 and 1887, resulted in a large increase in Irish immigration over the recorded amount of the previous decade.

England, Scotland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden, Canada, Switzerland, and the Netherlands combined, sent an increase of 772,000 over their immigration contribution of the previous decade.

In the United States conditions generally were conducive to immigration: industry was in an era of expansion and development following the recovery from the panic of 1873; railroad development continued; western lands were constantly being settled; six new states in the West (Idaho, Montana, the two Dakotas, Washington and Wyoming) were admitted to the Union; prosperity was everywhere apparent. The only untoward event in industrial circles was the series of labor strikes in 1886, marked by anarchistic riots in Chicago.

Immigrational details for the decade are presented in Table XXIX.

General signs of the return movement from America are apparent in these statistics. Hence the apparently small net Catholic immigration recorded. The Catholic gain, however, is fully one-third the total gain after deduction has been made for returns and deaths. The Catholic immigration has been computed on the "foreign-born" method, verified, for the British Isles and Ireland, by statistics for emigration. In the case of Austria-Hungary, Italy, Portugal, and Russia, in order to justify the method it is sufficient merely to point out the fact that the number of natives of these countries, respectively, present here in 1890 was less than the gross immigration. The phenomenon is explained only by a remigration.

In the case of Germany the method computes a net total immigration of 1,064,000 from a gross of 1,453,000—emigration thus amounting to about twenty-seven per cent of the immigration.

For the British Isles and Ireland there are statistics on emigration

TABLE XXIX

*Total Immigration, net Catholic Immigration, and foreign-born Increase, 1881-1890, and Foreign Born, 1890, by Nationality*

	Per Cent Cath.	Total Imm.	For. Born 1890	For.-Born Increase	Net Cath. Imm.
Aust.-Hungary . .	67.	353,719	303,812	168,262	134,000
Belgium . . . . .	95.	20,177	22,639	7,104	9,500
Denmark . . . . .	14	88,132	132,543	68,347	50
France . . . . .	90.	50,464	113,174	6,203	15,000
Germany . . . . .	35.8	1,452,970	2,784,894	818,152	400,000
Greece . . . . .	5	3,413	1,887	1,111	10
Italy . . . . .	90.	307,309	182,580	138,045	130,000
Netherlands . . . .	35.	53,701	81,828	23,738	10,800
Norway . . . . .	05	176,586	322,665	140,936	80
Poland . . . . .	75.	51,806	147,440	98,883	78,000
Portugal . . . . .	90.	16,978	15,996	7,858	8,000
Russia . . . . .	7.5	213,282	182,644	146,922	11,000
Spain . . . . .	90.	4,421	6,185	897	1,000
Sweden . . . . .	02	391,776	478,041	283,704	60
Switzerland . . . .	40.	81,988	104,069	15,448	10,500
Eng. & Wales . . .	5.	657,488	1,009,171	261,709	17,000
Ireland . . . . .	75.4	655,482	1,871,509	16,938	300,000
Scotland . . . . .	7.	149,869	242,231	72,095	6,000
Canada Eng. . . . .	12. }	392,802 <sup>x</sup>	{ 678,442 }	263,781	100,000
Canada Fr. . . . .	90. }	302,496	{ 302,496 }		
Mexico . . . . .	90.	1,913 <sup>x</sup>	77,853	9,454	15,000
All other . . . . .	10.	122,337 <sup>y</sup>	187,448	19,717	4,000
Total . . . . .		5,246,613	9,249,547	2,569,604	1,250,000

<sup>x</sup> There are no records for Canada and Mexico (immigration) from 1886 to 1895. Statistics for foreign born, however, make up for this deficiency.

<sup>y</sup> 61,711 Chinese, *S. A. U. S.*, 101.

tion from the United States. Such emigration amounted to 545,000 during the decade, or 37.4 per cent of the immigration. It would be tedious to set forth the complete mathematical computation of the distribution of this emigration among the Irish, Scotch, and English, as based on a study of the deaths among the natives of those countries present in the United States in 1880. The strict computation indicates a gain of 250,000 Catholic Irish. Nevertheless the Irish gain has been estimated at the considerably higher figure of 300,000 to guard against the danger of minimizing.

Besides the one and one-quarter million immigrants, the Church gained by natural increase during the decade nearly one and one-third million members. The rate for Catholics is estimated at twenty-one per cent, the general rate for the country having been nineteen per cent. Conversions are estimated at 85,000 on a basis of 6,000 priests in 1880 and 9,168 in 1890. The total Catholic membership in the latter year was thus very close to nine millions.

The hierarchical development kept pace with the increase in membership, and this was the banner decade of the century for the

erection of new dioceses, twenty being established. With the exception of 1883 not a year passed without the appointment of a new see, or some similar development: in 1881 Davenport and Trenton; in 1882 Grand Rapids; in 1884 Helena and Manchester; in 1885 Omaha; in 1886 Sacramento (formerly Marysville and Grass Valley, successively), Syracuse, and the vicariate of Salt Lake City; in 1887 Belleville, Cheyenne, Concordia, Denver, Lincoln, and Wichita. In 1888 St. Paul was made a metropolitan see; in 1889 Duluth, Fargo, St. Cloud, Sioux Falls and Winona were erected, and in 1890 Dallas became a see. There was now a total of eighty dioceses (thirteen of which were archdioceses) and five vicariates. The decade which celebrated the centenary of the establishment of the hierarchy made indeed a proud record in its development.

Further proof of the growing strength and unity of the Church is found in the fact that in 1884 the third Plenary Council of Baltimore convened, to its recommendations in great measure being due the unwonted establishment of so many new sees. It was also chiefly responsible for the founding of the Catholic University of America in 1889—a step eloquently proclaiming the progressiveness, the initiative, the generosity, the courage and the scholarship of the youngest daughter of the Church. The memorable action of the archbishops in presenting to the Holy See, through Cardinal Gibbons, the memorial against the condemnation of the Knights of Labor showed, too, the foresight and wisdom of the American hierarchy, who thus prevented the alienation of the laborer from the Church, and adumbrated the stand which Pope Leo XIII was to mark out later in his encyclical "Rerum Novarum."

Externally, the foundation of the "A. P. A.'s" in 1887, an organization directed specifically against the Catholic rather than against the foreigner, attested to the general recognition of the growth and the power of the Church. The ugly and petty-minded movement may have caused some harm in a few individual cases. In the long run it rather served to strengthen the outposts of the Church, to rouse sleeping sentinels, to infuse new vigor and enthusiasm among the rank and file. It was a veritable boomerang as all such movements tend to be.

The summary for the decade is as follows:

TABLE XXX  
*Summary, 1881-1890.*

U. S. white, 1880.	43,402,970	Cath. pop. 1880.....	6,259,000
Immigration .....	5,246,613	Cath. imm. inc.....	1,250,000
Increase by imm.	3,600,000	Cath. natural inc..	1,315,000
Foreign born, 1890	9,249,547	Conversions .....	85,000
U. S. white, 1890.	55,101,258	Cath. pop. 1890....	8,909,000

In contrast with the present estimate stand the corrected figures of the United States Census Bureau which estimated the number of Catholics in 1890 at 7,343,186.<sup>7</sup> Sadlier's Directory for 1890 estimated the Catholic population of that year at 7,855,294 according to incomplete returns at hand. The editor added a note to the effect that 10,000,000 would be a truer estimate of the actual membership. A full discussion of these estimates will be given in a later chapter.

### III. 1891-1900

The change in the complexion of the immigration is more marked and more definite in the closing decade of the nineteenth century. The number of immigrants from Austria-Hungary, Italy and Russia increased notably, while those from Germany, Ireland, and Great Britain registered a marked decrease. The net increase in the proportion of Catholics among the immigrants was not, however, so great as a fairly general impression would have it. This is due to the fact that the Italian immigration is in great measure impermanent, that the Russian immigration is decidedly non-Catholic; that the lowering of Irish immigration helped to lower the Catholic proportion; and finally the unprecedented decrease of nearly one million in the number of German immigrants cut down a movement which was one-third Catholic, while such nations as Denmark, Norway, and Sweden continued to send a fairly large number of immigrants, practically none of whom were Catholic.

The increase in the immigration from Austria-Hungary is to be explained by the combination of the causes indicated in the fifth chapter. The growing population felt more and more the adverse conditions of the agricultural situation and the land-tenure system, while the industrial group, small as it was, was detrimentally affected by the American tariff of 1890. The destruction of the pearl-button industry in Bohemia was attributed to that cause.<sup>8</sup> The contributory causes—reports of friends in America, pecuniary aid from that source, and other factors of a like nature—were also bearing more directly and concretely and to a greater extent as the number of Austrians and Hungarians in the United States increased. Of Italy and Russia much the same is to be said, except that in the case of the latter the Jewish situation was the chief single cause. Thus in 1899, when immigrant statistics were first recorded by *race*, of the 60,982 immigrants from Russia, 24,275 or 39.8 per cent were Hebrews.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Religious Bodies*, 1916, Part I, p. 30.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *E. C. E.*, p. 369.

<sup>9</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 272.

The tremendous decrease (from 1,452,000 to 543,000) in the number of immigrants who came here from Germany is to be attributed chiefly to the great strides made by German industry. The growing importance of Germany as one of the great powers, and especially her industrial and commercial expansion, tended to lessen the lure of emigration. In keeping with the Governmental policy of paternalistic care for the working man as evinced by the various insurance laws passed in the previous decade, Berlin succeeded in procuring in 1890 an international conference to discuss and devise ways and means looking to the welfare of the working classes. Whatever the motives behind the general movement, the result surely was to diminish radicalism and discontent by stealing the thunder of reformer and agitator.

Irish immigration decreased nearly forty per cent when compared with the preceding ten years. While the hopes of a successful issue in the Home Rule agitation of the decade may have had some influence in causing this result, the two main factors were the slightly better conditions in Ireland, and especially the adverse conditions of the financial panic in the United States, a situation to which Irish immigration has always immediately and measurably reacted.

The panic of 1893 is the chief point to be noted in chronicling events in the United States. By 1893 silver had so decreased in value that each silver dollar was worth only sixty-seven cents when compared with the purchasing power of the dollar a few years before. Fear, because of a decrease in the gold supply, that the Government would be forced to pay its debts in silver dollars led foreigners to sell American stocks and bonds and Americans to hoard gold. Money was consequently scarce, banks failed, and a general condition of unemployment resulted throughout the country. "Coxey's Army" of unemployed made its spectacular march on Washington; railroad strikes in and around Chicago were particularly disastrous; business was generally demoralized, and conditions were decidedly unfavorable to immigration.<sup>10</sup> The breaking out of the Spanish-American war when industry was regaining its equilibrium probably retarded somewhat the growth of immigration, but its effect was not great, especially as the war was of short duration. On the other hand the discovery of gold in the Yukon district in 1897 had much to do with reestablishing normal conditions in the country.

<sup>10</sup> After starting off with a rush in the first three years of the decade, immigration abruptly subsided upon the outbreak of the panic and did not approach normal until 1900. Statistics for the respective years, expressed in thousands are as follows:

1891	1892	1893	1894	1895	1896	1897	1898	1899	1900
560	579	439	385	358	343	230	229	311	448

The net result of the general situation was that what promised to be a record immigrational decade fell considerably below the mark set in the previous period. It was reserved to the next decade for the "new" immigration to establish a record for the century.

Statistics for the period appear in the following table:

TABLE XXXI

*Total Immigration and Emigration, net Catholic Immigration, and foreign-born Increase, 1891-1900, and Foreign Born, 1900, by Nationality.*

	Per Cent Cath.	Total Imm.	Total Em.	For. B. 1900	For.-B. Increase	Net Cath. Imm.
Aust.-Hungary	67.	597,047	250,000	578,512	274,700	232,000
Belgium .....	95.	20,062	10,000	29,757	7,118	9,000
Denmark .....	.2	52,670	17,000	153,805	21,262	75
France .....	90.	36,006	20,000	104,197	— 8,977 <sup>x</sup>	4,000
Germany .....	36.	543,922	245,000	2,663,418	— 121,476 <sup>x</sup>	105,000
Greece .....	.5	15,996	9,000	8,515	6,628	25
Italy .....	90.	655,694	220,000	484,027	301,447	390,000
Netherlands .	35.	31,816	7,000	104,931	23,103	11,000
Norway .....	.08	95,264	33,000	336,388	13,723	50
Poland .....	75.	169,977	25,000	383,407	235,967	190,000
Portugal .....	90.	23,010	7,000	30,608	14,612	14,000
Russia .....	8.	423,726	130,000	486,367	241,082	12,000
Spain .....	90.	6,723	5,000	7,050	865	1,800
Sweden .....	.03	230,679	60,000	572,014	93,973	50
Switzerland .	40.	33,-49	7,000	115,593	11,524	10,000
Eng. & Wales	5.	282,280		934,099	— 75,072 <sup>x</sup>	3,000
Ireland .....	74.2	403,496	625,000	1,615,459	— 256,050 <sup>x</sup>	40,000
Scotland .....	8.	60,053		233,524	— 8,707 <sup>x</sup>	2,000
Canada Eng..	18.		100,000	784,741	106,299	36,000
Canada Fr....	90.	2,631 <sup>y</sup>		395,066	92,570	125,000
Mexico .....	90.	746 <sup>y</sup>	10,000	103,393	25,540	30,000
All other ....	10.	159,473 <sup>z</sup>	20,000	216,405	91,598	10,000
Total .....		3,844,420	1,800,000	10,341,276	1,091,729	1,225,000

<sup>x</sup> Decrease.

<sup>y</sup> Records incomplete for immigration; cf. statistics for foreign born.

<sup>z</sup> 23,000 Chinese.

To facilitate discussion of the results arrived at, an additional column is presented in the preceding table giving the emigration for the decade, on which statistics the figures for the net Catholic gain, as indicated in the final column, are to a great extent based. These statistics on emigration are partially themselves an estimate but the proportion of estimate in them as compared with the proportion of actual statistical records is very slight. The table posits an emigration of 1,800,000 during the decade. It is of record that 1,124,000 left the United States for the United Kingdom alone, during the decade,<sup>11</sup> and that 221,000 left for

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Table IX.

Italy,<sup>12</sup> thus accounting with certainty for all but 455,000 of the emigration recorded in Table XXXI. In other words, the present estimate is that while 1,345,000 had departed for Italian and British ports, at least 455,000 had departed for ports of other countries.

Moreover, there is further evidence in American statistics to show that the preceding is not merely an estimate. When the census of 1900 was taken it disclosed the fact that there were present in the United States only 2,609,173 persons who had entered during the current decade.<sup>13</sup> In other words, 1,235,000 of the current immigration had departed. Now many of the 2,609,000 present here were Mexicans and Canadians, probably 200,000 at least, and are not to be counted in the deduction since they were not counted in the immigration.<sup>14</sup> Hence of the other than Canadian and Mexican immigrants 1,435,000 had departed. This supposes then that 365,000 immigrants who had entered in other decades also departed. The supposition is very reasonable and accordingly it can be stated with little fear of error that the total emigration (including the deaths among current immigrants) was 1,800,000.

The next question which presents itself is the distribution of these emigrants. Of what nationality were they? An analysis of the statistics on the number of foreign born by nationality in the United States in 1900 and in 1890 leads to the results set forth in the new column in Table XXXI. In the case of Italy, Britain, and Ireland this computation in its results coincides with the actual statistics quoted.

One further question awaits solution. Of the 625,000 British and Irish who left the United States, how many were British and how many were Irish? In other words, of the 120,000 net immigration from Great Britain and Ireland how many were Irish and accordingly predominantly Catholic? It would seem that the majority were certainly not Irish.

As an illustration of the general principles upon which such a conclusion is based the computation of the Irish immigration for the decade follows. Table XXXI records a decrease of 256,000 Irish born during the decade. This does not, however, mean that 256,000 more persons of Irish birth had emigrated than had entered the country during the decade. It means that the emigration plus the deaths was greater by that amount than the net immigration.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Table VIII.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. *S. R. I.*, p. 410, Table 3.

<sup>14</sup> Records of immigration from Canada and Mexico are incomplete—practically missing—for this decade.

<sup>15</sup> Some have erroneously supposed that the increase in foreign born is equivalent to increase by immigration. It is decidedly not equivalent, since in the increase (or decrease) in foreign born the greatest factor, once a

The Irish-born population of 1890—numbering 1,871,000—having an increasingly large number of older persons among it, may well have suffered a loss of fourteen per cent by deaths during the decade. In other words 267,000 represents the number of deaths that have to be replaced by immigrants before a gain in the number of Irish born can be recorded. If there had been a net immigration (total immigration minus emigration) of 267,000 the number of Irish born would have remained unchanged. Actually, however, there was a loss of 256,000 showing that the net immigration was only 11,000 Irish during the decade. The computation may be made in the same way for England and Scotland, as in fact was done, not only for these countries but for all recorded in the table. In the case of Ireland, however, to avoid all objection that the death rate of fourteen per cent is too low, the higher rate of 16½ per cent has been adopted, giving a total of 310,000 deaths. A loss of 256,000 then means that 54,000 deaths were replaced by immigrants, giving a net Catholic gain of 40,000 Irish immigrants for the decade.

Apparent discrepancies in the case of other nationalities in Table XXXI are explained by analysis and comparison. A net immigration of 16,000 from France is recorded, while the gain in French Catholics is only 4,000. This is due to the fact that some 10,000 Hollanders entered this country from France as the foreign-born computation discloses. In the same way the German and Russian gain seems low due to the fact that many Polish came from these two countries. In the computation a Catholic gain of 190,000 Poles is accordingly recorded, whereas only 169,000 are recorded in the gross immigration.

In the case of Canada and Mexico, for which nationalities the immigration statistics are defective, the defect has been made up for by a study of statistics for the Canadian and Mexican born which indicate that there was probably a gross immigration of 450,000 Canadians and 44,000 Mexicans, the net figures being 340,000 and 33,000 respectively.

The result of the decadal computation is that a gain of 1,225,000 Catholics, or, forty-eight per cent of the total net immigration of 2,538,000,<sup>16</sup> is recorded.

The rate of natural increase among Catholics is placed at twenty large body of foreign born is present here, is the deaths among those immigrants who have been here for some time. This factor of deaths among other than current immigration is allowed for in computing natural increase. It is incorrect, then, to deduct it again in computing immigrational increase. For further discussion of this problem cf. the following chapter. Cf. also *S. R. I.*, p. 409.

<sup>16</sup> The total gross immigration was really 4,338,000 when those from Mexico and Canada are included. Deducting 1,800,000 for emigration leaves a net result of 2,538,000.

per cent for this decade—almost two per cent higher than the general rate for the whole population—thus recording a gain of 1,782,000 due to this factor. There was in 1890 a total of 9,168 priests who had increased to 11,987 in 1900 and the convert increase is accordingly estimated at 125,000, the total Catholic population to be accounted for in 1900 being 12,041,000.

The most noteworthy event in the history of the Church during the decade was the establishment of an Apostolic Delegation at Washington in 1893. This event is chiefly of importance in that it evinced in a clear and agreeable manner the recognition on the part of the Holy See that the American Church was fast divesting itself of the swaddling clothes of its infancy. The Church which in the previous decade had successfully launched a pontifical university and had been honored for the second time by having one of the members of its hierarchy raised to the dignity of a cardinal, now welcomed with every manifestation of loyalty and honor the personal representative of the Holy Father.

Hierarchical development was on a limited scale during the decade. The vicariate of Oklahoma was established in 1891. In the same year the vicariate of Salt Lake was erected into a see; that of Boise became a diocese in 1893, and that of Tucson in 1897. Dubuque was raised to the archiepiscopal dignity in 1893 and Vincennes was translated to Indianapolis in 1898. There were in 1900 eighty-three dioceses (of which fourteen were archdioceses) and three vicariates apostolic.

The summary for the decade appears in the following table.

TABLE XXXII  
*Summary, 1891-1900.*

U. S. white, 1890 .	55,101,258	Cath. pop. 1890...	8,909,000
Immigration .....	3,844,420	Cath. imm. inc....	1,225,000
Increase by imm..	2,538,000	Cath. natural inc..	1,782,000
Foreign born, 1900	10,341,276	Conversions .....	125,000
U. S. white, 1900..	66,809,196	Cath. pop. 1900...	12,041,000

Current estimates of the Catholic population in 1900 generally placed it as close to 12,000,000 with somewhat of a tendency to hold that it was above that figure.

#### IV. 1901-1910

The first decade of the twentieth century witnessed the definitive change in the complexion of American immigration, while it proved also to be the banner immigrational decade of the hundred years embracing the limits of the present study. Of the eight and four-

fifths millions of immigrants who entered the country during this decade, five and four-fifths millions came from Austria-Hungary, Italy and Russia alone.

The causes of this great increase in the number of immigrants coming to the United States from these three countries have been sufficiently indicated in previous chapters. It may be added here that the economic causes, which constitute the chief factor, tend to operate in a "vicious circle." The economic situation promotes emigration, and emigration aggravates the evils of the economic situation, which in turn produces further emigration—and so the endless chain continues.

In Italy, for example, emigration had after twenty years resulted by 1901 in decreasing the population between twenty-one and fifty years of age from 40.29 per cent in 1881 to 35.59 per cent of the total population in 1901.<sup>17</sup> Although the general population had continued to increase, in many towns and localities of southern Italy and Sicily the number of inhabitants had actually decreased. The net result was that while the reduction of the labor supply brought about a large increase in wages among the laboring classes so that the general condition of the nonlandholding peasantry was greatly improved, on the other hand, the land-owners, both large and small, were seriously affected by the high wages and the lack of labor, and many of the smaller proprietors were ruined. In many cases agricultural land was abandoned since it did not pay to operate it. This in turn led to higher prices for produce, and both the landowner and the laborer found it profitable to emigrate to America.<sup>18</sup>

The economic situation in Austria-Hungary at the beginning of the twentieth century is best illustrated by a brief discussion of the agricultural and industrial situation.<sup>19</sup> In Austria, out of a total population of over 26,000,000, more than one-half were dependent on agriculture and forestry in 1900; in Hungary out of a total population of over 19,000,000, over sixty-eight per cent were dependent on the same pursuits. In some districts agriculture is the predominating occupation to an even greater extent. Eighty-six per cent of the population of Dalmatia are supported by agriculture and forestry, while seventy-seven per cent of the population of Galicia, and in Carniola seventy-two per cent, are similarly employed. When we remember the evil of subdivision of the land the inevitable result is apparent.

The most obvious phase of the economic situation is the smallness of the amount paid for labor. In Austria in 1897, of eighty-one "natural districts" reporting the average daily wages of farm laborers in winter, thirty-five paid from ten to sixteen cents, and

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *E. C. E.*, p. 221.

<sup>18</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 362 *et seq.*

<sup>19</sup> *Ib.*

twenty-three paid from sixteen to twenty cents. For women the rate in two-thirds of the districts was from ten to sixteen cents. In summer the wages were somewhat higher. When food was not furnished the wages were from twelve to twenty cents higher. In Hungary, for the year 1905, the mean daily wage, with food, of farm laborers, was twenty-two cents for men, fourteen for women and ten cents for children. When food was not furnished the additional wage for men was nine cents; for women seven cents; and for children five cents. When to the foregoing data is added the fact that of the 627,000 industrial establishments in Austria in 1902, 555,971 had each less than six workers, and only 831 had at least 300 workers each, only 26.2 per cent of the population of Austria being dependent on industry, we can appreciate the reasons why emigration from the dual monarchy grew so by leaps and bounds.<sup>20</sup>

While the situation in Russia was similar a discussion of the economic situation is unnecessary since religious conditions were so intertwined, that the most significant fact is that of the 1,163,000 who entered this country from Russia during this decade, 704,000 were Hebrews and 433,000 were Poles.<sup>21</sup> As has been previously pointed out, the Jews have always contributed practically a majority of our immigrants from Russia. How far the Russo-Japanese war contributed to increase this influx is problematical, but it is a fact that Hebrew immigration from Russia amounted to only 47,000 in 1903, rising to 77,000 in 1904, 92,000 in 1905 and 125,000 in 1906. It will be apparent that the proportion of Catholics from Russia will be small when it is stated the Russian Poles are classed in the decadal tables as Polish and not Russian, the bulk of the latter being, therefore, Hebrews.

Referring briefly to immigration from other countries, that from Germany decreased during the decade; Greece registered a great increase, as did also Norway and Sweden, England and Scotland; while Ireland again appears with a substantial decrease.

In America conditions for the greater part of the decade were conducive to immigration. The industrial depression, however, which commenced in October, 1907, had the usual twofold effect. It checked the rush of immigrants, on the one hand, and, on the other, it caused during the three following years, an unprecedented exodus of foreigners from the country. Had it not been for this financial flurry this decade would probably have registered an immigration of over ten millions—more than a million a year. In 1906 and 1907 and again in 1910, after the recovery, the number of immigrants was appreciably over one million. In 1908 and 1909 it dropped to about three-quarters of a million. A record of the exodus in the years 1908, 1909, and 1910 has been set

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *E. C. E.*, p. 366.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *S. R. I.*, p. 62.

forth for certain nationalities in Table IV. Complete United States statistics record the fact that in these three years 823,000 emigrants departed from the country.<sup>22</sup> The result was that the net immigrational gain was much lower than it would have been had not the financial disturbance occurred.

The decadal table follows :

TABLE XXXIII

*Total Immigration and Emigration, net Catholic Immigration and foreign-born Increase, 1901-1910, and Foreign Born, 1910, by Nationality*

	Per Cent Cath.	Total Imm.	Total Em.	For. B. 1910	For.-B. Increase	Net Cath. Imm.
Aust.-Hungary	67.	2,145,266	919,000	1,341,164	762,652	553,000
Belgium .....	95.	41,635	17,000	49,400	19,643	21,000
Denmark .....	.3	65,285	13,000	181,649	27,959	150
France .....	90.	73,379	24,000	117,418	13,221	26,000
Germany .....	36.5	341,498	241,000	2,311,237	— 352,181 <sup>x</sup>	36,500
Greece .....	.5	167,519	74,000	101,282	92,767	450
Italy .....	90.	2,045,877	1,154,322	1,343,125	859,098	802,000
Netherlands...	35.	48,262	7,000	120,063	25,132	14,350
Norway .....	.08	190,505	167,000	403,877	67,489	10
Poland <sup>z</sup> .....	75.	(865,361)	209,000	943,781	560,374	608,400
Portugal .....	90.	69,149	36,000	59,360	28,752	30,000
Russia .....	8.	1,597,306	250,000	1,314,092	832,534	16,000
Spain .....	90.	27,935	11,000	22,108	15,058	14,000
Sweden .....	.05	249,534	71,000	665,207	83,193	10
Switzerland .	43.	34,922	9,000	124,848	9,255	10,000
Eng. & Wales	5.	405,481	621,000	960,207	26,108	4,000
Ireland .....	73.8	339,065		1,352,251	— 263,208 <sup>x</sup>	10,000
Scotland .....	10.	120,469	100,000 <sup>y</sup>	261,076	27,552	6,130
Canada Eng...	18. }	179,226		819,554	34,758	20,000
Canada Fr ...	90. }	49,642	20,000	385,083	— 10,043 <sup>x</sup>	20,000
Mexico .....	90.	603,431	400,000	417,189	118,522	120,000
All other ....	10.				195,775	4,000
Total .....		8,795,386	4,323,000	13,515,886	3,174,610	2,316,000

<sup>x</sup> Decrease.

<sup>y</sup> 496,959 according to R. H. Coats, Dominion statistician. Cf. *World Almanac*, 1924, p. 575.

<sup>z</sup> Columns 4 and 5 unofficial, listing 5,897 more than official statistics.

As in the table for the preceding decade, a supplementary column is here added in which emigration statistics are adduced. This column makes it easier to explain more fully many apparent anomalies in Table XXXIII which would otherwise puzzle one who would attempt to analyze them.

Table XXXIII, if it did not record the emigration from this country, might lead one to conclude that the net Catholic immigration of the decade amounted to only about twenty-five per cent of the total immigration. However, a glance at the supplementary

<sup>z</sup> *S. R. I.*, p. 372.

column leads to the more correct conclusion that the two and one-third million Catholic immigrants amounted to nearly one half of the total net immigration.

While complete statistics on emigration for the decade are not yet available (they began to be recorded in detail only in 1908) there are, nevertheless, statistics for certain countries and some general statistics of the United States Government, which prove that the general conclusion to be reached from a study of the number of foreign born in 1901 and 1910 is correct. Table XXXIII lists an emigration of 4,323,000. The most important particular factor in this computation is the fact that in the census of 1910, of the 8,795,000 who had entered the country since January 1, 1901, there were enumerated as present here almost exactly 5,000,000,<sup>23</sup> the other 3,795,000 having remigrated or died in the meantime.<sup>24</sup> It must be remembered, however, that returning immigrants do not all come from the current immigration and when Table XXXIII lists an additional 528,000 emigrants (about twelve per cent of the total) this action is not only conservative<sup>25</sup> but is justified by an analysis of the foreign-born population at the beginning and the end of the decade.

Having ascertained the total emigration, the next problem is to distribute it according to nationality. For Italy and the United Kingdom statistics are available.<sup>26</sup> For the other countries the distribution is determined by the method used in the previous decade—a comparison of the deaths among the foreign born present at the beginning of the decade with the increase or decrease in the number during the decade. This method is used also in apportioning according to nationality the returns to the United Kingdom, since the statistics available give only the grand total.

A further explanation is necessary in regard to certain nationalities. In the case of Austria-Hungary the enormous immigration of over 2,000,000 produced a net result of only 826,000 due to the large emigration and also to the fact that 400,000 of those coming from Austria-Hungary were Poles<sup>27</sup> and are listed as such in the table. So too in the case of Russia 433,000 were Poles<sup>28</sup> and they are accordingly deducted from the former in the present computation. Accordingly the present table lists a Polish immigration of 865,000 (32,000 having come from Germany) although the United States official statistics do not list any Polish immigration

<sup>23</sup> Cf. *A. T. C.*, p. 78.

<sup>24</sup> It is unnecessary to attempt to compute how many emigrated and how many died since the effect is exactly the same in either case.

<sup>25</sup> The movement to Canada alone is estimated by a Canadian statistician at 496,959. Cf. Table XXXIII.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Tables VIII and IX.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. *S. R. I.*, p. 53.

<sup>28</sup> *Ib.*, p. 62.

under the heading "Poland." It may be well to add that the statistics of Polish immigration are in parentheses to indicate that, since they are duplicated in those for Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia, they are not to be included again in the total at the foot of the column.

Finally it may be remarked that statistics on Canadian and Mexican immigration are defective, as nearly always, owing to the ease with which persons of those nationalities can enter this country without being enumerated. The census of foreign born corrects this defect, however, and thus while in this decade an immigration of only 49,000 Mexicans is officially recorded, the present table lists a gain of 120,000 Catholic Mexicans. Hence also the sum of the returns plus the net immigration is in excess of the total immigration as listed by the Government.

Statistics for the category "all other" seem large when compared with the net Catholic immigration under the same heading. The discrepancy is due to the fact that the great majority of these were from Asia (Japan, China, Turkey) and from Turkey in Europe and Roumania.<sup>29</sup>

The rate of natural increase for the decade, after deducting the immigrational increase, is found to be thirteen per cent. In computing the Catholic natural increase the higher rate of fifteen per cent is adopted. This is very high when a comparison is made with a race for which the rate is certain. The rate for this decade among the Negroes, usually a prolific race, was 11.2 per cent.<sup>30</sup> It is apparent that the rate of natural increase among the Negroes is certain since no other external factor, such as immigration, enters in to disturb the calculation. The natural increase among Catholics accordingly amounted to 1,806,000. The number of converts during the decade is estimated at 200,000 on a basis of 11,987 priests in 1900 and 16,550 in 1910. The Church had thus reached a total membership of 16,363,000 in 1910 according to these statistics.

Progress during the decade had been marked. The most important event, from an ecclesiastical point of view, was the action of Pius X when in 1908 he transferred the dioceses of the United States from the jurisdiction of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide and decreed that thenceforth they should be governed by the common law of the Church.<sup>31</sup> The significance of this act was that the American Church was no longer a "mission." The Church in the United States had proved by the wisdom and pru-

<sup>29</sup> About 500,000 were from these countries and from Africa. Cf. S. A. U. S., p. 100.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. *Negro Population*, p. 25.

<sup>31</sup> Apostolic Constitution, *Sapienti Consilio*, June 29, 1908. Cf. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, I, p. 7.

dence and zeal of its hierarchy, by the increasing number and the earnest devotion of its priests, by the generosity, loyalty and fidelity of the faithful, that it could now rightfully take its place as a full-grown and flourishing daughter of Holy Mother Church.

The appearance during this same decade of the first volume of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* gave evidence that American Catholics could, too, be leaders in the sphere of intellectual endeavor which many erroneously thought was closed to them because of lack of scholarship and initiative. The successful completion of this momentous undertaking is its own answer to such misapprehensions.

Hierarchical development showed increased activity during the decade, with the establishment of twelve new dioceses. East of the Mississippi, Altoona was founded in 1901, Fall River in 1904, Superior in 1905, Rockford in 1908 and Toledo in 1910. West of the Mississippi, Lead and Sioux City were erected in 1902, Baker City in 1903, Great Falls in 1904, Oklahoma (formerly a vicariate) in 1905, and Bismarck and Crookston in 1910. In the latter year also the see of Nesqually was transferred to Seattle, and that of Natchitoches to Alexandria.

The Church now numbered ninety-five dioceses (fourteen of which were metropolitan sees) and two vicariates. In membership it led all other religions in the country, and in vigor, vitality, loyalty, generosity and general fidelity to Catholic teaching, it can safely be asserted that it yielded first place to the Church of no other land, in proof whereof it need only be stated that the evils of modernism, so rampant during the decade, gained little foothold in the American Church.

The decadal summary follows:

TABLE XXXIV

Summary, 1901-1910.

U. S. white, 1900 .	66,809,196	Cath. pop. 1900 . . .	12,041,000
Immigration . . . . .	8,795,386	Cath. imm. inc. . . . .	2,316,000
Increase by imm.. . .	4,696,000	Cath. natural inc. . . . .	1,806,000
Foreign born, 1910. . .	13,515,886	Conversions . . . . .	200,000
U. S. white, 1910. . .	81,731,957	Cath. pop. 1910 . . . . .	16,363,000

A comparison between the Catholic membership listed in the foregoing table and other estimates for the year 1910 will be made in a later chapter where detailed treatment will be paid the subject.

#### V. 1911-1920

The final decade of the century under discussion bade fair to set another high record, averaging as it did for the first four years

over one million immigrants a year,<sup>32</sup> when the World War set in, abruptly causing immigration to recede to a minimum, while at the same time greatly accelerating emigration from our shores. As it was, nearly five and three-quarter millions of immigrants came to the United States during the decade, but the net gain was not in proportion. Emigration during the period amounted to 3,988,082 and the net immigration was accordingly only 1,747,729.<sup>33</sup>

So obvious are the causes that affected immigration and emigration during this decade that no elaboration of the same is necessary. It is clear that during the first four years of the decade the phenomenal inrush of immigrants was due to a congeries of all the causes mentioned more in detail previously. It is evident also that the exodus of foreigners from this country was due to some extent to the exactions of the military service laws of their home lands, while the same laws, and other conditions, naturally operated to prevent any great movement to America.

With this brief introduction the decadal table is presented to the reader (p. 180).

Table XXXV records a Catholic gain of 1,202,000 in a net immigrational gain of only 1,747,729.<sup>34</sup> The proportion is slightly exaggerated since the net immigrational gain was really somewhat higher, as will appear later. It is essential to note that in the present table statistics do not take account of the post-war boundary changes in Europe. The chief value of these statistics is in drawing comparisons with the previous decade, a process which would be futile and misleading if the 1910 statistics were determined by the boundaries of that year, while the 1920 boundaries would determine the later statistics. If, for example Austria-Hungary of 1910 be compared with Austria and Hungary of 1920, in computing the foreign born of those nationalities present here at the beginning and the end of the decade, it is necessary to record a decrease of 369,000. By taking into account, however, the natives of Czechoslovakia, and Jugo-Slavia, and other compo-

<sup>32</sup> Immigration for the first four years of the decade was as follows: 1911, 878,587; 1912, 838,172; 1913, 1,197,892; 1914, 1,218,480—a total of 4,133,131. Cf. *S. A. U. S.*, p. 92.

<sup>33</sup> This statement requires a slight qualification to be rightly understood. Immigration amounted to 5,735,811, the statistics not including non-immigrant aliens entering the country. In the 3,988,082 emigrants, however, are included the so-called "nonemigrant" aliens who depart from the United States. A study of the statistics for the foreign born justifies this for most nationalities, for this decade, as will be apparent from the discussion of the decadal table. The reason probably is that many nonemigrants going to Europe, intending to return, were prevented by the war from doing so.

<sup>34</sup> Again I would call attention to the fact that the Catholic gain is not to be based on the foreign-born increase. Thus in this decade the foreign-born increase for all nationalities was only 367,209 while the Catholic gain was over a million.

TABLE XXXV \*

*Total Immigration and Emigration, net Cath. Immigration, and foreign-born Increase, 1911-1920, and Foreign Born, 1920, by Nationality*

	Per Cent Cath.	Total Imm.	Total Em.	For. B. 1920	For.-B. increase	Net Cath. Imm.
Aust.-Hungary	67.	896,342	414,470	1,504,780	163,616	239,000
Belgium	95.	33,746	11,637	62,686	13,286	20,000
Denmark	.3	41,983	11,209	189,154	7,505	100
France	90.	61,897	73,997	118,569	1,151	18,000
Germany	36.5	143,945	51,938	1,720,423	590,814 <sup>x</sup>	10,000
Greece	.5	184,201	128,229	175,972	74,690	350
Italy	90.	1,109,524	911,753	1,610,109	266,984	275,000
Netherlands	35.	43,718	16,193	131,766	11,703	10,000
Norway	.08	66,395	28,170	363,862	40,015 <sup>x</sup>	25
Poland	75.	(474,226) <sup>y</sup>	....	1,139,978	196,197	250,000
Portugal	90.	89,732	26,335	67,453	8,093	16,000
Russia	8.	921,957	207,356	1,684,781	370,689	20,000
Spain	90.	68,611	40,181	49,247	27,139	27,000
Sweden	.05	95,074	23,345	625,580	39,627 <sup>x</sup>	25
Switzerland	43.	23,091	7,526	118,659	6,189 <sup>x</sup>	7,000
Eng. & Wales	5.	263,051	249,386	879,894	80,313 <sup>x</sup>	2,000
Ireland	73.8	145,937	40,728	1,037,233	315,018 <sup>x</sup>	70,000
Scotland	10.	78,601	43,519	254,567	6,509 <sup>x</sup>	3,500
Canada Eng..	18. }	742,185	821,580 <sup>z</sup>	{ 823,334	3,780	24,000
Canada Fr...	90. }			{ 307,786	77,297 <sup>x</sup>	0
Mexico	90.	219,004	93,615	478,383	256,468	200,000
All other	10.	486,712	786,915	366,538	121,205	10,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>5,735,811</b>	<b>3,988,082</b>	<b>13,712,754</b>	<b>367,209</b>	<b>1,202,000</b>

\* Statistics follow pre-war boundaries. Columns 4 and 5 are unofficial for foreign-born white stock. For official cf. *A. F. C.*, pp. 304 and 366.

<sup>x</sup> Decrease.

<sup>y</sup> Included in Russia, Germany, etc.

<sup>z</sup> Canadian statistics; compiled by R. H. Coats, Dominion Statistician. Cf. *World Almanac*, 1924, p. 575.

nant parts of the old dual monarchy an increase of 163,000 is disclosed. Hence the old designation "Austria-Hungary" is retained and the 1920 computation is made for the old territory. Similarly the 1920 statistics for natives of Germany include natives of Alsace-Lorraine although the latter had been returned to France. The question of Poland as one of the new countries formed after the war needs no special treatment here since the statistics relating to the Polish were already segregated in the tables previous to this decade.

Commenting in detail on those individual nationalities, the statistics for which seem to require some explanation, it may be noted first that while there is listed a gain of 18,000 French Catholics, the emigration of that nationality is recorded as greater than the immigration. The correction is made by the death-rate method, leading to the conclusion that some of the 74,000 departing for France were either nonemigrants or not natives of France.

Among the German born there appears a decrease of 590,000 during the decade. This means that the deaths among the Germans present here in 1910 exceeded by that number the net immigration of the decade. Naturally the longer immigration has been coming here from a given country, the greater will be the mortality each decade among the natives of that country here, because of the increased number of aged. To suppose that there took place during the decade among the German born of 1910 more than 600,000 deaths would be equivalent to saying that that population was in the same condition as the 1790 population of the United States was in 1845.<sup>35</sup> That this was the case can hardly be admitted, for the German population here constantly receives new blood, so that the young and sturdy additions to its numbers offset to a certain extent the large number of old people in the population. Accordingly it must be that the emigration of Germans was much larger than the recorded figure, and the situation previous to and after America's entrance into the war forces the conclusion that many Germans were successful in surreptitiously slipping out of the country. It is possible also that some Germans at the time of the census concealed their German origin, for personal reasons. The death-rate computation would lead to the conclusion that the Church had actually lost between 50,000 and 70,000 German members during the period. The straight immigration-emigration method would list a gain of about 30,000 Catholics. As a compromise the Catholic gain is estimated at 10,000.

In the case of the Italian born the situation is exactly reversed. The death-rate method lists a greater net immigration than does the other method, and accordingly a gain of 275,000 Catholics is listed although the net immigration according to statistics was only 198,000.

The case of the Irish is similar to that of the Germans. The death-rate method seems to indicate that the emigration of this stock outnumbered the immigration by perhaps 100,000 during the decade. This is possible but hardly probable, and accordingly it is assumed that the death rate was simply excessive—as indeed it must have been on account of the war and the influenza epidemic. Hence a gain of 70,000 Irish Catholics is recorded. It would perhaps be more just to record neither gain nor loss since the fact that the death rate was (and always has been) excessively high among the Irish has the same effect as if in reality the excessive loss were due to emigration.

For the French-Canadians the fact is clear that there was no Catholic gain by immigration of that nationality. Rather was

<sup>35</sup> A study of survival among the original inhabitants of 1790 shows that of those alive in 1830, 27.4 per cent would die in the following decade. Cf. Table LXVIII.

there a loss. The table simply lists no gain. The total gain of 1,202,000 Catholics seems large when compared with the net immigration. An unduly large proportion has probably been listed as Catholic in this decade in keeping with the attitude throughout the study of never minimizing Catholic gains. By so doing, whatever losses there may have been will not in turn be minimized.

In computing the natural increase among Catholics for the decade, twelve per cent is adopted as the rate, a rate considerably greater than that for the country, which showed only a ten per cent increase. We must bear in mind the effect of the war and the influenza epidemic and also the fact that immigration continued to show the usual excess of males as found in former years.<sup>36</sup> Illustrative of the fact that the Catholic rate is high it is interesting to note that the rate for Negroes was only 6.5 for the decade.<sup>37</sup> The rate adopted places the Catholic natural increase at 1,963,000. Adding 300,000 as the number of converts (there were 16,550 priests in 1910 and 21,019 in 1920) the estimate of the Catholic population in 1920 is just under 20,000,000.

Hierarchical development continued during the decade, all the sees that were erected being west of the Mississippi, an encouraging sign indicative of a healthy growth on the part of the Church in the West. In 1911 Des Moines was erected, in 1912 Corpus Christi (formerly a vicariate) and Kearney (translated to Grand Island in 1917). In 1913 Spokane was established, in 1914 El Paso and in 1918 Lafayette. A Ruthenian-Greek diocese embracing the entire country was also established in 1913 while in 1916 Alaska was made a vicariate. There was accordingly in 1920 a total of 102 dioceses<sup>38</sup> (including the Ruthenian-Greek) and two vicariates (including Alaska). Fourteen of the dioceses are metropolitan sees.

A summary of the decade follows :

TABLE XXXVI  
Summary, 1911-1920.

U. S. white, 1910.	81,731,957	Cath. pop. 1910....	16,363,000
Immigration .....	5,735,811	Cath. imm. inc.....	1,202,000
Increase by imm..	2,000,000	Cath. natural inc.	1,963,000
Foreign born, 1920	13,712,754	Conversions .....	300,000
U. S. white, 1920.	94,820,915	Cath. pop. 1920....	19,828,000

The final figure—19,828,000 as the estimate of what the Catholic population would be expected to be in 1920—is so close to

<sup>36</sup> Of the 5,735,811 entering the country between 1910 and 1920, 3,643,385, or 63.5 per cent were males and 2,092,426 or 36.5 per cent were females. Cf. *S. A. U. S.*, p. 92.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. *Negro Population*, p. 25.

<sup>38</sup> The number was increased to 103 in 1923 by the erection of the diocese of Monterey and Fresno; to 104 by the erection of Raleigh in 1924.

20,000,000 that the latter will be adopted in the following pages as the result at which this statistical study arrived.<sup>39</sup> The significance of this result, a comparison with present-day estimates and other allied questions will be discussed in the chapters that follow.

<sup>39</sup> This figure, too, practically takes into account the approximately 250,000 Negro and Indian Catholics in the country.

## CHAPTER XI

### A SUMMARY OF THE CENTURY

In the first chapter three points were indicated, upon the determination of which the success of this study depends.<sup>1</sup> The first two points in question having now been determined, a brief survey of what has so far been done will be in order before proceeding to a discussion of the third point.

Starting with the year 1790, following the establishment of the hierarchy in the United States, an estimate of 35,000 was reached as the Catholic population of that year—the estimate being based on Archbishop Carroll's figures, and founded, too, on a study of colonial conditions. A discussion of the growth of the Church from 1790 to 1820 followed, and an estimate of 195,000 as the Catholic population in the latter year was arrived at. This estimate, then, became the starting point of the study proper. Here attention may be once more called to the fact that this estimate is lower by about 49,000 than Archbishop Marechal's estimate on the same point, but considerably higher than other contemporary estimates.<sup>2</sup> As pointed out in the fourth chapter, Archbishop Marechal's statistics erroneously listed a gain, excessive by 49,000, of 75,000 Catholics through the accession of Louisiana and Florida. Admitting this correction the foregoing estimate is fundamentally in agreement with his. It is preferable to those which minimize the Catholic population and may be considered as nearly a correct one as one can hope to obtain at this day. I would emphasize here the fact that this 195,000 estimate is to be taken not only as the theoretical but as the actual Catholic population of the United States in 1820.

However, in the long discussion, leading, by decadal computa-

<sup>1</sup> (a) The 1820 Catholic population; (b) the rate of increase among Catholics during the century and the mark which the Catholic population would be expected to have reached by 1920; (c) the actual Catholic population in 1920.

<sup>2</sup> Bishop England refers to an estimate, without naming the author of it, of 100,000 Catholic population in 1820. "Upon my first arrival in the United States in 1820 I saw in a public document, coming from a respectable source, the estimate to be 100,000, and this favorable and from a gentleman by no means unfriendly." Cf. Chap. XIV. As we shall see in the same chapter Bishop England's statistics are untrustworthy, the particular estimate mentioned here being especially so. Cf. p. 72 for Dr. Matignon's estimate of 140,000.

tions, up to the second point—the theoretical Catholic population of 1920 (*i.e.* what it should rightfully be if no loss occurred)—it is important to bear in mind the fundamental principle that the decadal estimates do not claim to represent what the Catholic population actually was at the end of each decade, for that would be to beg the question which is precisely at issue. They represent rather what the respective decadal Catholic populations should have been had no loss in the meanwhile occurred. That the decadal theoretical estimates in many, if not most, cases agree substantially with contemporaneous statements of the actual Catholic population somewhat anticipates the conclusion of the study. The definite conclusion, however, is reserved for the following chapters, inasmuch as the later decades of the century present complications which require further investigation for a proper solution.

The fundamental principles underlying the decadal computations have been that: (1) the rate of natural increase among Catholics of the United States is the same as is found in the population as a whole; (2) the percentage of Catholics among immigrants is the same as in the country from which they come; the net immigration being computed as the difference between the gross immigration and the sum of the emigration plus the deaths among the current immigration; and (3) conversions are estimated at the rate of one and one-half per priest per year.<sup>3</sup>

Though the above statement in regard to natural increase is taken as a fundamental principle yet it was deviated from in every decadal computation from 1860 to 1920, in each of which a rate for Catholics two per cent higher than the general rate was adopted. We must here bear in mind the fact that the application of such a rate for Catholics is equivalent to a far higher rate than it appears to be, in view of the data adduced in the sixth chapter in regard to the preponderance of males among our immigrants, the high mortality rate among many of them, and the low marriage rate among their children.

Furthermore, it may be stated without fear of successful contradiction that the contention that the natural-increase rate among foreign peoples is far higher than that prevailing in the United States is somewhat of a myth due to the fact that the proponents of such a view consider only the high birth rate and neglect to

<sup>3</sup> It must be apparent that this is merely a method of striking an average as a means of estimating conversions. Certainly some priests average far more conversions; some have none, because their work is of such a nature that circumstances do not put them in the way of conversions; and finally some conversions can be attributed directly to laymen or simply to the grace of God, rather than to the activity of the priest who happens to receive the particular subjects into the Church. As a matter of fact the average adopted holds good pretty generally so far as statistics are available, and hence it is adopted for all decades.

take into consideration the high death rate which in so many cases accompanies the same. The following table giving, for the year 1909, statistics for various nations, discloses the fact that the rate for Catholics adopted in this study is not only equal to, but even well above, any in the list when one takes into account the data referred to on the preponderance of males among immigrants.

TABLE XXXVII \*

*International Birth,- Death,- and Natural-Increase-Rates per 1,000 of the Population in 1909*

Country	Birth-rates	Death-rates	Excess of B.-over D.-rates.
United Kingdom .....	25.5	14.8	10.7
England & Wales.....	25.6	14.5	11.1
Scotland .....	26.4	15.3	11.1
Ireland .....	23.5	17.2	6.3
Ontario (1908) .....	24.9	13.9	11.0
Denmark .....	28.0	13.1	14.9
Norway .....	26.1	13.5	12.6
Sweden .....	25.6	13.7	11.9
Russia (Europe, 1904)...	48.4	29.8	18.6
Finland .....	31.3	16.7	14.6
Germany (1908) .....	32.1	18.1	14.0
Prussia .....	31.8	17.0	14.8
Austria (1908) .....	33.5	22.3	11.2
Hungary .....	37.0	25.1	11.9
Roumania .....	41.7	27.8	13.9
Bulgaria (1908) .....	40.4	24.3	16.1
Serbia .....	36.5	29.3	7.2
The Netherlands .....	29.1	13.7	15.4
Belgium (1908) .....	24.9	16.5	8.4
France .....	19.6	19.3	0.3
Switzerland (1908) .....	27.1	16.2	10.9
Spain .....	32.6	23.4	9.2
Italy .....	32.4	21.4	11.0

The above table gives respectively in the three columns the *number* of births and deaths and the *numerical* excess of births over deaths for each 1,000 of the population. In Ireland, therefore, for example, there were at the end of the year 1909 six and three-tenths more persons for each thousand of the population than there were at the beginning of the year.<sup>5</sup> The computation, to repeat, is numerical, but it happens that the third column gives also, *in per cent*, the natural-increase rate for a decade for the total population, supposing the rate to be constant for ten years.<sup>6</sup> The

\* Cf. *The Statesman's Year-Book*, 1911, p. li.

<sup>5</sup> Exclusive, of course, of the emigration movement. Cf. Table III, according to which, by independent computation, the same rate is found to hold in Ireland, not only for the year 1909, but for the whole period from 1871 to 1909.

<sup>6</sup> Disregarding the slight additional increase—one-half of one per cent on a total of ten per cent—due to compounding through the decade.

explanation of this phenomenon is simple. If, for example, the excess of births over deaths for 1,000 of the population, for one year, is 10 (appearing therefore as "10.0" in the third column of the above table) it would be 100 for ten years, if the rate is constant; but 100 is *ten per cent* of 1,000 and therefore while the *numerical* increase is *ten persons per*, 1,000 per year, the *per cent* increase is ten per cent for the whole population for the decade.

Accordingly column three of this table enables one to compare the rate adopted in this study for the decade in which 1909 occurred with ascertained European statistics for that year. The rate adopted for Catholics for the decade from 1901 to 1910 is fifteen per cent (Table XXXIV). Yet it is apparent from the present table that only two countries (which, incidentally, send very few Catholics to the United States) are listed with a higher percentage; that the majority are far below this figure; and that, more specifically, the rate of all the Catholic countries of Europe, immigration from which determines chiefly the American Catholic rate, are very considerably below the rate adopted. Surely the rate for natives of Ireland, Austria, Hungary, Belgium, France, Spain and Italy will not be greater in America than it is in their own countries, while all the evidence indicates that it will be even lower.<sup>7</sup> Surely then the decadal rate adopted may be considered even excessive under the circumstances.

It is impossible, and unnecessary, to give similar statistics for the entire United States, since such statistics are not compiled for the whole country, but only for a part of the country—the "birth-registration area," which in 1900 included about 39.3 per cent of the population of the continental United States. In that year the birth rate was 27.2 per 1,000, the death rate 15.4, the excess of births over deaths 11.8 per 1,000, and the corresponding decadal rate of increase for the decade would be 11.8 per cent.<sup>8</sup> The decadal rate for Catholics for the decade in which the year 1900 occurred is twenty per cent (Table XXXII). For purposes of comparison Table XXXVIII is presented, giving statistics in detail for the birth-registration area of the United States for the year 1919.

The rate for Catholics for the decade in which this year occurs was twelve per cent (cf. Table XXXVI).

Further statistics on the same point, for the earlier period from 1865 to 1883 are adduced in Table XLI. They indicate exactly the same features as the present discussion, thus proving that this phenomenon is not merely one of the twentieth century, but has been general during the period which the present study covers.

<sup>7</sup> The death rate for foreigners of several nationalities in this country is excessive. This is particularly true of the Irish, and fairly true of the Italians and Germans. Cf. footnote, p. 129.

<sup>8</sup> *Statesman's Year-Book*, 1911, p. 360.

TABLE XXXVIII<sup>a</sup>

*U. S. Birth-registration Area Birth-, Death-, and Natural-Increase-Rates,  
per 1,000 of the Population in 1919*

Area	Births	Deaths	Excess Births
California .....	16.8	13.7	3.1
Connecticut .....	24.8	13.3	11.5
District of Columbia.....	18.9	14.7	4.2
Indiana .....	20.3	12.7	7.6
Kansas .....	20.6	10.8	9.8
Kentucky .....	24.0	12.8	11.2
Maine .....	20.2	14.6	5.6
Maryland .....	23.6	15.3	8.3
Massachusetts .....	22.9	13.6	9.3
Michigan .....	23.2	12.6	10.6
Minnesota .....	21.9	10.5	11.4
New Hampshire .....	19.8	14.7	5.1
New York .....	21.9	13.9	8.0
North Carolina .....	29.1	12.2	16.9
Ohio .....	19.8	12.7	7.1
Oregon .....	17.4	11.4	6.0
Pennsylvania .....	24.0	13.4	10.6
South Carolina .....	26.6	13.8	12.8
Utah .....	29.3	11.0	18.3
Vermont .....	19.9	14.4	5.5
Virginia .....	26.5	13.7	12.8
Washington .....	18.7	10.7	8.0
Wisconsin .....	20.9	10.7	10.2
Total .....	22.3	13.0	9.3

In the application of the immigrational principle (of which more will be said in a later section of this chapter) it must be remarked that the computation has been by nationality, which leads to a much more accurate result than any assumption that the Catholic percentage of immigration will be in such or such proportion to the gross total.

In order to afford a comprehensive view of the entire period covered, the results of the decadal computations are summarized in the following table (XXXIX).

The question of method is so important that a further elaboration of the subject is presented here by means of a comparison of the present work with a recent study of the same question.<sup>10</sup> To

<sup>a</sup> Cf. *S. A. U. S.*, p. 74. Column 3, has the same application as in Table XXXVII.

<sup>10</sup> Most Rev. J. Regis Canevin, D.D., "Catholic Growth in the United States," Pittsburgh (no date; ab. 1923). This pamphlet is substantially the same as the same author's article in *Truth*, April, 1912, except that the former completes the subject to the year 1920. Cf. also his article in the *Catholic Historical Review*, Jan. 1918.

TABLE XXXIX  
*Catholic Growth, 1820 to 1920*

Decade Ended	Nat. inc. Rate	Natural Increase	Immigration Increase	Conversions	Cath. Pop.
1820 ...	..	.....	.....	.....	195,000
1830 ...	32.	63,000	54,000	6,000	318,000
1840 ...	30.	95,400	240,000	9,600	663,000
1850 ...	30.	198,900	726,100 *	18,000	1,606,000
1860 ...	30.	482,000	985,000	30,000	3,103,000
1870 ...	20.	620,000	741,000	40,000	4,504,000
1880 ...	24.	1,081,000	604,000	70,000	6,259,000
1890 ...	21.	1,315,000	1,250,000	85,000	8,909,000
1900 ...	20.	1,782,000	1,225,000	125,000	12,041,000
1910 ...	15.	1,806,000	2,316,000	200,000	16,363,000
1920 ...	12.	1,963,000	1,202,000	300,000	20,000,000 †

\* Including 26,100 territorial increase.

† Figure adopted. The addition gives 19,828,000 as the final total.

facilitate discussion and understanding of the points raised, a comparative table of the results of the two studies is herewith presented.

The result at which Archbishop Canevin's study arrives calls for a Catholic population in 1920 greater by practically three million than does the result arrived at in the present study, as Table XL points out. The reason for this difference lies in the different methods of computation used. A discussion and comparison of the methods will prove that two serious errors have crept into the pamphlet, and to these errors is due the greater supposititious 1920 Catholic population advanced by the latter. Reference is to the method of computing the natural increase and the immigrational increase.

According to the study referred to, it is stated, under "Rules of Computation" <sup>11</sup> that,

the rate of natural increase for the Catholic population has been determined by a comparison of the excess of baptisms over deaths in various growing dioceses in this and other countries. It ranges in each decade from thirty-five per cent under the most favorable conditions, down to twenty per cent, and is modified in each period by the increase or decline of Catholic immigration.

The method—comparing the excess of baptisms over deaths—is *per se* the correct method to use, if it were certain that the numerous deaths of infants will always be classed as deaths by pastors, and if in addition it were possible to get accurate, trustworthy and general statistics on the point. These, however, it is

<sup>11</sup> P. 10.

TABLE XL  
*Catholic Growth 1820-1920, two Studies.*

Decade Ended	Present Work <sup>12</sup>			Arbp. Canevin Pamphlet
1830	195,000		Cath. pop., 1820.....	243,000
	69,000	32%	Natural increase.....	82,620
	54,000		Imm. increase.....	12,000
	318,000		Cath. pop., 1830.....	337,000
1840	105,000	30	Natural increase.....	111,414
	240,000		Imm. inc.....	212,220
	663,000		Cath. pop., 1840.....	661,254
1850	216,900	30	Natural increase.....	218,213
	726,100		Imm. increase.....	888,374
	1,606,000		Cath pop., 1850.....	1,767,841
1860	512,000	30	Natural increase.....	583,387
	985,000		Imm. increase.....	1,041,980
	3,103,000		Cath pop., 1860.....	3,392,980
1870	660,000	20	Natural increase.....	780,385
	741,000		Imm. increase.....	728,501
	4,504,000		Cath. pop., 1870.....	4,901,866
1880	1,151,000	24	Natural increase.....	1,568,597
	604,000		Imm. increase.....	556,357
	6,259,000		Cath. pop., 1880.....	7,026,820
1890	1,400,000	21	Natural increase.....	2,108,046
	1,250,000		Imm. increase.....	1,284,802
	8,909,000		Cath. pop., 1890.....	10,419,668
1900	1,907,000	20	Natural increase.....	2,604,917
	1,225,000		Imm. increase.....	513,112
	12,041,000		Cath. pop., 1900.....	13,537,697
1910	2,006,000	15	Natural increase.....	3,384,424
	2,316,000		Imm. increase.....	1,561,199
	16,363,000		Cath. pop., 1910.....	18,483,320
1920	2,263,000	12	Natural increase.....	4,066,330
	1,202,000		Imm. increase.....	183,604
	19,828,000		Cath. pop., 1920.....	22,733,254

simply impossible to obtain. There are no such *general* statistics extant for the dioceses of this country, and if one could obtain

<sup>12</sup> The estimates for conversions in the present work are here included in the statistics for natural increase, since the pamphlet with which comparison is made did not make any allowance for conversions.

statistics for a given diocese there would still be a serious error in applying them to the whole country.

The chief error lies in the fact that the accuracy of the natural-increase rate which is based on diocesan statistics, depends finally on an accurate census of the Catholic population. Let it be granted—without conceding—that it is possible to get accurate statistics on the excess of baptisms over deaths in a given diocese. This tells what has been the total gain—*numerically*—due to natural increase. To translate this into *percentage* it is essential to know the exact total Catholic population. This latter is unobtainable without a census properly so-called both at the beginning and the end of the period to which the statistics would apply, together with a precise determination of the factors of emigration and immigration at the same time. So far no censuses of Catholic population have taken place in the United States on any extended scale, if indeed there has ever been a complete diocesan census, in the strict sense, for any one diocese.<sup>13</sup> Again, granting that it were possible to obtain a correct percentage for one diocese, it would still be quite incorrect to apply this percentage to all the dioceses of the country for dioceses differ from dioceses in the racial make-up of the population, in profession and occupations of the people, and in comparative proportions of urban and rural population, and these factors all have such a bearing on both the birth rate and the death rate that they must, if at all possible, be taken into account.

They are taken into account in the present study when the general rate for the country is taken as the rate for Catholics. As already stated more than once, two per cent is added to this rate for the decades since 1860, as a concession to the opinion that Catholics—because they are Catholics, and because so many of them are immigrants—register a higher natural increase than others in this country. It is hardly controvertible that Catholics, because they are Catholics, do tend to register a higher *birth rate*. It is not so clear, however, that the net result—excess of births over deaths—is so much higher, when we take into consideration the greater mortality, and especially infant mortality, among the poor, who undoubtedly constitute the bulk of our Catholic population. The second opinion, that immigrants register a higher rate of increase, is, as pointed out above, somewhat of a myth. Tables XXXVII and XXXVIII give some comparative figures for the year 1909, according to which the rate in Europe was not any higher than that in the United States in 1919. Lest it might be said that the year 1909 is a modern year, and the comparison un-

<sup>13</sup> Practically a complete census was made of the Denver diocese in 1924. Harrisburg, Chicago, New York, and some others, have made good beginnings.

fair, the following table is adduced for the period from 1865 to 1883, and the same result is obtained.

TABLE XLI<sup>14</sup>

*Annual international Birth-, Death-, and Natural-Increase Rates per 1,000 of the Population for Period 1865-1883 (inc.)*

Countries	Birth-rates	Death-rates	Excess of B.- over D.-rates. (Decadal per cent inc.)
Europe			
Russia excluded.....	35.4	25.8	9.6
Russia included.....	38.7	28.1	10.6
England and Wales.....			
Scotland .....	34.7	21.4	13.3
Ireland .....	26.4	17.8	8.6
Norway .....	30.8	17.2	13.6
Sweden .....	30.2	18.9	11.3
Denmark .....	31.3	19.7	11.6
Finland .....	35.5	27.0	8.5
Average of N.W. Europe..	32.0	20.5	11.5
Holland .....	35.9	24.6	11.3
Belgium .....	31.5	22.4	9.1
France .....	25.4	23.8	1.6
Germany .....	39.0	26.6	12.4
Alsace-Lorraine .....	34.0	26.0	8.0
Prussia .....	38.8	26.5	12.3
Saxony .....	42.4	29.0	13.4
Thuringia .....	36.8	24.9	11.9
Baden .....	37.8	27.3	10.5
Württemberg .....	42.6	31.5	11.1
Bavaria .....	39.5	30.6	8.9
Switzerland .....	30.2	23.1	7.1
Poland, Russian .....	41.9	26.8	151.
Austria .....	38.4	31.0	7.4
Hungary .....	43.0	38.2	4.8
Croatia and Slavonia....	45.3	38.7	6.6
Average, Central Europe...	37.6	28.3	9.3
Portugal .....	31.9	21.0	10.9
Spain .....	33.9	29.1	4.8
Italy .....	36.8	29.1	7.7
Roumania .....	29.7	26.5	3.2
Serbia .....	43.6	26.7	16.9
Greece .....	28.4	20.8	7.6
Average, So. Europe.....	34.0	25.6	8.4
Russia (E. Europe).....	49.4	35.7	13.7
United States			
Massachusetts .....	25.7	19.2	6.5
Vermont .....	21.0	14.3	6.7
Connecticut .....	23.6	16.0	7.6
Rhode Island .....	23.1	16.2	6.9
Average of the four states	23.4	16.5	6.9

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *The Statesman's Year-Book*, 1886, p. xxii.

It will be apparent from a consideration of the data presented in the preceding table that the pamphlet under consideration practically takes the birth rate and not the excess of births over deaths as a rate of natural increase. The logical conclusion from the foregoing data is that the natural increase among immigrants is not appreciably greater than the general rate for the United States. Any slight doubt that may still remain is dispelled by the data set forth in Chapter VI on the disparity of sexes among the immigrants and the low marriage rate among their children, for the natural-increase rate is determined by the number of marriages and not merely by the gross population. Nor can this statement be weakened by claiming that the surplus males find mates among other than immigrants. Certainly some do, but the fact that the same surplus proportion of males is found among the emigrants from this country<sup>15</sup> is proof that the surplus males, in great majority, do not marry at all, since the emigration from this country practically equals the number of surplus males among the immigrants. The net result as regards the pamphlet under consideration is that the rate of natural increase adopted by it is far too high.

On the other hand, the rate of natural increase adopted in the present study is substantially higher than that listed in Government publications, even without taking into consideration the two per cent addition made for the decades from 1860 to 1920. Mr. Wm. S. Rossiter has calculated, in a Census Bureau monograph,<sup>16</sup> the increase in population by decades had there been no immigration nor emigration. His results, compared with statistics of the present day, follow.

TABLE XLIIa

*Per Cent estimated population Increase, eliminating Immigration and Emigration.*

	Decade Ended									
	1830	1840	1850	1860	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910	1920
Rossiter.....	31.8	27.7	25.3	22.8	18.5	19.0	16.3	15.2	13.2	10.9
Present study....	32.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	20.0	24.0	21.0	20.0	15.0	12.0

The method adopted by the pamphlet in computing the immigrational increase involves an equally grave error. The rule adopted reads as follows:

The increase by immigration in any period is *the difference between the foreign-born population* at the beginning and at the end of the period.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup> From 1908 to 1910, 82.7 per cent of all departures were males; and 85.4 per cent of southern and eastern Europeans emigrating from this country were males. Cf. p. 99, quoting *E. C. E.*, p. 45.

<sup>16</sup> *Increase of Population in the United States, 1910-1920*, p. 152.

<sup>17</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 10.

Such a method overlooks the fact, referred to several times in the present work, that the deaths among the foreign born who are present here at the beginning of a period must not be deducted from the gross immigration when computing the net immigration. The reason is that such deaths are accounted for when computing the natural increase. If, for example, it is stated that the rate of natural increase among Catholics for the last decade covered by this study (1910-1920) was twelve per cent, it is equivalent to saying that the number of Catholics in 1920 was, so far as this factor alone is concerned, twelve per cent greater than the 1910 Catholic population. In other words, it is equivalent to saying that the number of births among the Catholics of 1910 exceeded the number of deaths among that same body by 1,963,000 during the decade.

Now, among the Catholics of 1910 there was a large number of foreign born, a certain number of whom died during the decade. Their deaths tend to counterbalance the arrival of immigrants when the increase of foreign born here is computed, but it is a grave error to confuse *foreign-born increase* with *immigrational increase* for the two are not the same at all. Foreign-born increase equals immigration minus the sum of (1) deaths among the foreign born here at the beginning of the period; (2) deaths among the current immigration; and (3) return emigration.<sup>18</sup> Immigrational increase, on the other hand, has absolutely nothing to do with the deaths among the foreign born here at the beginning of the period. Immigrational increase equals immigration minus the sum of (1) the deaths among the current immigration and (2) the return emigration.

Hence it is that while the *foreign-born increase* for the decade 1911-1920 was only 367,209<sup>19</sup> the *immigrational increase* was some 2,000,000. Hence, also, it is, that while the pamphlet under discussion lists in this decade a Catholic immigrational gain of only 183,604 persons ("fifty per cent of increase of foreign-born population")<sup>20</sup> the present study lists a Catholic immigrational gain of no less than 1,202,000.<sup>21</sup> In the same way the other discrepancies apparent in Table XL are explained.

The fact that at the end of a given decade there may be in this country a smaller number of persons born in Germany or Ireland, for example, than were present here at the beginning of the decade does not *necessarily* mean that there was no immigrational increase for this country by the movement of persons from Germany

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *S. R. I.*, p. 410.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Table XXXV; this is the increase among the foreign-born white. The total increase among the foreign born was 404,806. Cf. Table XLII.

<sup>20</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 13.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Table XXXV.

or Ireland. The increase among foreign born of a given nationality depends more on the ratio between the number here at the beginning of the decade, and the net immigration, than it does on anything else. Thus, for example, if we suppose that in 1860 there were no Austrians in this country and that a net immigration of 10,000 of that nationality entered during the following decade, the net immigration and the foreign-born increase would both be the same—10,000. But if in the next decade 2,000 of these died, and at the same time a net immigration of 2,000 entered the country, the number of foreign born (Austrians in the example) would have remained unchanged; foreign-born increase would be zero, yet immigrational increase would be 2,000. The 2,000 deaths were a factor discounted in the natural increase. The 2,000 immigration is a real gain, for it replaces the loss already allowed for in the natural-increase computation.

The fundamental point underlying the whole question is that the larger the foreign-born population here becomes, and the greater the percentage of old people among them, the greater will be the number of deaths, and hence the greater must be the net immigration, in order first to replace these deaths, before it can register an increase in the foreign born. Yet none the less is it true that the 1911-1920 immigration of 5,735,000 produced a greater immigrational increase than did the 2,598,000 of the decade 1851-1860, although the latter caused a foreign-born increase of 1,894,000,<sup>22</sup> while the former produced a foreign-born increase of only 367,000.

A comparison, illustrating the points raised, of immigration and foreign-born increase is set forth in the following table for the period from 1850 to 1920. It will be remembered that there are no statistics, of a reliable and general nature, on the number of foreign born previous to 1850.

TABLE XLII<sup>23</sup>

*Immigration and Increase of foreign-born Population compared, by Decade, 1850-1920*

Decade Ended	Immigration	Foreign-born Numerical	Increase Per Cent of Imm.
1920.....	5,735,811	404,806	7.0
1910.....	8,795,386	3,174,610	36.1
1900.....	3,687,564	1,091,716	29.6
1890.....	5,246,613	2,569,617	49.0
1880.....	2,812,191	1,112,714	39.6
1870.....	2,360,878	1,428,532	60.3
1860.....	2,648,912	1,894,095	71.5

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Table XXIII.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. decadal tables of the present work; also *S. R. I.*, p. 410.

The reason for the discrepancies between the two studies as exhibited in Table XL should now be apparent. The reasons adduced constitute the basis of the stand in presenting the estimate of the present work—20,000,000—as the number which the Catholic population of the United States should be in 1920. The following chapters will attempt to establish the relation between this theoretical figure and the actual Catholic population of that year. An effort will be made, in other words, in view of the data that have been adduced in the course of this work, to answer as definitely and categorically as possible the question whether there has been a lamentable loss to Catholicity in the past century because of the great immigration to the United States.

## CHAPTER XII

### THE CATHOLIC POPULATION IN 1920

The third point underlying this entire study is yet to be determined. What was the actual Catholic population of the United States in the year 1920? It has been shown that if the American Church held her own during the century she should number in 1920 about 20,000,000 members. If there were that number, or at least approximately that many, the conclusion must follow that there has been no loss, or at least no great loss, to Catholicity in the United States during the century.

The great difficulty in the way of the final conclusion lies in the fact that there are no conclusive and reliable data on the number of Catholics in the United States in 1920, although the general opinion of most authorities placed it at 20,000,000 or more. Had there been a Catholic census in or near that year the answer would be simple. There was no Catholic census in that year; there never has been a Catholic census in the United States. Accordingly, in coming to the final conclusion, estimates for the year 1920 and other years must be depended on, such estimates being evaluated, and if necessary modified, in the light of various data which will be brought to bear upon them.

To elucidate first the statement made above that there has never been a census of the Catholics of the United States. The Government in 1890, 1906 and 1916 issued religious statistics which many Catholic writers and periodicals have at times designated as "official," "reliable," "a census," because issued by the Government. Actually these statistics are no more a census than is the compilation made annually by the Catholic Directory. The compilation of the latter is the result of incomplete returns made by the diocesan authorities, who send in the figures forwarded to the chanceries by the parish priests. The only difference between the Directory statistics and the Government statistics is that the latter come direct from the priests without passing through the chancery.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Reference is more particularly to statistics for 1906 and 1916 but what has been said is true of those for 1890 also. Information in regard to a few points—e.g. number of churches, accommodations, value of church property—was issued by the Government in 1850, 1860 and 1870 but in no case did it include statistics of membership. No statistics at all are available for 1880 as the inquiries begun were never completed. Cf. *Religious Bodies, 1916*, Part I, p. 12 and p. 24.

The census bureau of the Government in compiling the religious statistics that it does, labors under the same difficulties and drawbacks as do the compilers of the Catholic Directory, while there is in addition at least one element—that of actual opposition—which can hardly be considered as manifested toward the latter. To quote the officials of the census bureau in their 1916 report on these statistics, in regard to the difficulties encountered:<sup>2</sup>

In the conduct of the work, both in the collection of the statistics and the interpretation of schedules, certain difficulties were encountered which deserve special mention.

First, was the lack of accurate and complete lists of churches or ministers. In even the best-organized bodies published lists were not infrequently found to be unreliable, churches that had become dead or dormant were still carried on the rolls, while changes of address were innumerable.

Second, the failure of pastors or clerks and even of denominational officers to reply promptly. The situation in this respect was better than in 1906, but the fact that over 175,000 were sent out to churches and to ministers, and that the collection of the schedules covered a period of 15 months, as just explained, indicates the extent to which dilatoriness in reply hampered the work of the bureau.

Third, the unwillingness of many to make replies to the inquiries. A considerable number of churches protested against the inquiries, claiming that the United States Government had no constitutional authority to make any investigation in regard to religious matters, and one denomination refused to furnish any figures, whatever. In most cases an explanation of the situation brought a response, but this required considerable correspondence and involved no little delay.

Fourth, failure to answer some of the inquiries, and inconsistencies in the answers to others, which had to be supplied or corrected before the transcription work could be done.<sup>3</sup>

However, of the two schedules<sup>4</sup> sent out, that sent to local organizations, and containing among other inquiries a request for information on membership, met with a general response, so far as the percentage of answers goes, since a report was obtained from

<sup>2</sup> The remarks apply to all religions and are not restricted, in their application, to Catholics. The writer, however, was informed by one of the higher officials in charge of the work that the remarks do apply especially to Catholics.

<sup>3</sup> *Religious Bodies*, 1916, Part I, p. 13.

<sup>4</sup> One schedule was sent to "local church organizations." This included the inquiry as to membership. The other was sent to individual priests, as such. *Op. cit.*, pp. 11 and 12.

all but 112 of the 17,487 Catholic local organizations (parishes and equivalents) listed in 1916.<sup>5</sup> The fundamental defect, therefore, with the Government statistics is that they represent merely the guess or conjecture of the pastor, and not a census in any sense of the word. In addition some failed to answer at all, and others were not reached owing to defective lists. Finally the very dilatoriness in replying puts the answers under suspicion, since the latter will be in so many cases a mere offhand makeshift estimate given in an unfortunate spirit of "duress" as it were upon the receipt of a second or third reminder.

As stated above, the final source of the statistics listed in the Catholic Directory is the same as of those compiled by the Government. The basis of the Directory's annual estimate of the Catholic population is always the same pastoral estimate of the membership of a flock. Unfortunately too, in addition to this unscientific aspect of the case, it is often impossible to obtain returns from the diocesan authorities, presumably because even the unsatisfactory returns from the pastors are not available and so the Directory has been known to print, year after year, the same statistics—as to membership, church organization, priests, schools, and other similar data—for a diocese. When, furthermore, errors creep in, as they do, in regard to the hierarchy, sometimes a deceased or resigned bishop being listed as the Ordinary of a diocese to which another has in the meantime been appointed, it requires no stretch of the imagination to conceive of the errors which are allowed to pass in regard to the numerous other details. Under all the circumstances indicated the unsatisfactory character of the statistics is self-evident.

Admitting that the two sets of statistics are unsatisfactory it may be asked what the net effect is. Are the resultant figures too high or too low; do they, in the common estimation of Catholics, and according to the judgment of competent authorities, fall below or do they mount above what is considered as the actual Catholic population of the years in question? The answer is that all authorities are agreed that both the Catholic Directory and the Government statistics far understate the actual Catholic population for the years to which they have reference. It may be admitted that many persons hold this intuitive view more as a sentiment rather than because of any concrete reasons which they can advance. Nevertheless, some very weighty and cogent reasons

<sup>5</sup> It must be remembered that even in its lists of parishes and pastors the Directory, from which the Government took its addresses, is often very defective since even these statistics are often reprinted without change from year to year, thus failing often to note the existence of new parishes.

The personal inquiries made of priests by the second schedule did not meet with such success, only 13,435 out of a total of 20,287 answering. *Op. cit.*, Part II, p. 654.

can be adduced in the face of which the answer is practically incontrovertible.

The proposition advanced in the previous paragraph seems to go contrary to a generalization in an earlier chapter: "Where numbers are guessed they are always magnified." The remark holds true as a general rule. But when there are material reasons acting as an incentive to underestimate rather than exaggerate in one's guesses, then one may be sure the remark does not apply. Then there is certainty that the estimate of the pastor as to the membership of his flock is not going to be overestimated.

Now, with reference first to the Directory statistics, it happens that there is a general, in fact universal, incentive acting as a check against overestimating Catholic membership by those in charge of parishes. The check is, purely and simply, the danger that an overestimate—which, of course, would have a cumulative effect from year to year—would be liable to lead the diocesan authorities to divide a parish claiming a population so large that in the opinion of the Ordinary it could not satisfactorily be cared for by one parish church. Although the pastor's estimates may be only a guess, when parochial interests are concerned he guards against an overstatement. He protects the parish and himself against the danger of a premature division of the old, a premature erection of a new parish.

The result of this situation is that year after year, even decade after decade, the annual return on parochial membership remains unchanged and the diocesan total in turn is merely reprinted from issue to issue by the Directory.<sup>6</sup> In the year 1890 so discouraging was the situation, both because of the facts related above and because of the failure on a large scale to obtain diocesan returns at all, that the editor of the Directory in noting 7,885,000 as the estimate of the Catholic population according to the returns received, repudiated it as being nowhere near a just estimate, claiming that the true number was nearer 10,000,000.

A brief reference to the Directory statistics for a few dioceses over a period of years will illustrate graphically and clearly the point raised that the annual membership reported tends to be too low rather than too high. The Catholic population of the arch-diocese of Boston for the years 1910, 1916, 1920 and 1924 is

<sup>6</sup> Whether this be the true *reason* or not; whether the repetition of statistics is due to the action of pastors in transmitting erroneous, unchanged statistics to the Ordinary, or to the action of diocesan authorities in failing to revise the totals from year to year before transmitting them to the Directory, or finally to a failure on the part of the Directory to change their totals after having received revisions from the dioceses (and this latter possibility is not probable)—whatever be the *reason*, the *fact* remains that the Directory reprints by the wholesale diocesan statistics from year to year.

given as 900,000; of Chicago it is listed as 1,200,000 in 1906, and 1,150,000 in 1910, 1916, 1920 and 1924, (the apparent decrease being due to the erection of the diocese of Rockford, with an estimated Catholic population of 50,000, out of a part of the see of Chicago, in 1908); the number of Catholics in the Cincinnati archdiocese is given as 200,000 for the years 1900, 1906 and 1910, and in 1924 the estimate is 218,000—a supposed nine per cent gain from all sources in twenty-four years; Dubuque numbered 111,000 in 1910, 1916 and 1920 and only 114,000 in 1924; New York reports 1,200,000 in 1900 and 1906 and 1,219,920 in 1910 and 1916. The estimate for the latter for 1924 is 1,273,000, recording a gain of *six per cent* from all sources in twenty-four years!

Were one to accept such statistics, he would be accepting the statement that the Catholic population of such Catholic centers as Boston, New York, Chicago, Cincinnati, and Dubuque actually remained stationary for periods of from ten to fifteen and even twenty-five years in length. A further comparison of statistics for other dioceses reveals the same conditions. The obvious conclusion is that the statistics quoted do not represent any real attempt even to estimate the Catholic population, far from their giving the results of even a quasi-census. In lieu of further data, the editors of the Directory have merely reprinted the same figures from year to year. Yet it is plain that in these dioceses which record absolutely no growth over long periods of time, there must have been a healthy increase, since it is precisely in these dioceses that all the signs of growth are found in an unmistakable manner and even to an unprecedented degree. In those dioceses parishes have multiplied, churches and schools are flourishing, the number of priests and religious has risen in a marked manner, and religion is unanimously considered as never having been on a stronger and healthier basis. If it be admitted that the earlier estimates were at least somewhere near the actual figure—and the probability is, as pointed out above, that they were really below it—then it needs no more argument to clinch the point that the recent estimates of the total Catholic population are woefully under the true figure.<sup>7</sup>

An examination of the official statistics of the United States census bureau discloses the same peculiar phenomenon—a supposititious lack of growth in Catholic centers—with this difference, however, that these statistics posit, not merely a lack of Catholic growth but an actual decrease of the Catholic population in numerous communities throughout the country during the decade from 1906 to 1916. The presence of this phenomenon is rather

<sup>7</sup> A striking corroboration of the validity of the preceding argument is afforded by the Denver diocesan census of 1925 which listed 200,000 Catholics although the Directory for 1924 listed only 114,000. Cf. *Denver Catholic Register*, Feb. 5, 1925, p. 1.

strange, at first sight, in view of the fact that the same reason for underestimating cannot be said to exist in this case.<sup>8</sup> A further investigation, however, discloses some reasons why one might expect an underestimate in 1916, while it also proves beyond any doubt that the losses posited could not have occurred, leading to the further conclusion that such an underestimate is actually present in the Government statistics for 1916.

The 1890 estimate—7,331,000—may be dismissed with the remark that the results of the compilation of that year were so unsatisfactory even to the Government that in 1900 no attempt was made to compile any religious statistics. This fact and the well known opposition to the action of the census bureau in attempting to compile religious data in 1890, thus leading many not to send in any results at all, constitute sufficient reason for considering the 1890 estimate as too low. Especially is this evident in the light of the fact that it was lower than the Directory estimate by half a million although the Directory experienced particular difficulty that year in obtaining returns.

The census bureau compiled no religious statistics in 1900, but at the end of the year 1906 statistics were gathered under the provisions of the permanent census act, approved March 6, 1902, as amended by the act of June 7, 1906, providing for the compilation of such statistics for every year ending in the figure "6."<sup>9</sup> The total Catholic membership exceeded by well over a million the Directory figures for the same year, and is practically in agreement with the supposititious estimate of the present study when the mid-decade compilation is carried out for the year 1906. Even in this year, however, the probabilities are that the statistics were under the true figure rather than over, for much opposition was expressed, and much unwillingness shown in complying with the census bureau's request for information.<sup>10</sup> However, the bureau's estimate of 14,210,000, as compared with the Directory estimate of 13,089,000 is easily the preferable one in view of the incompleteness of the data of the latter. The census estimate, as stated, is in practical agreement with the statistics of the present study which would list 14,600,000 in 1906.

At the close of the year 1916, in accordance with the provisions of the law, the bureau again compiled religious statistics. The estimate reached—15,721,815—posited a mere 10.6 per cent in-

<sup>8</sup> The same incentive to underestimate, it is true, cannot be said to be present here, but nevertheless the tendency will be to send to the Government bureau the same figures as transmitted to the diocesan authorities.

<sup>9</sup> *Op. cit.*, Part I, p. 11.

<sup>10</sup> This despite the co-operation of the archbishops decided upon at their annual conference in 1907, and the appointment of Archbishop Glennon of St. Louis by the Government as a "census official." Cf. *Catholic Encyclopedia*, V., 27, art. "Directories."

crease from all sources over the population of 1906. It was one million and one-third under the Catholic Directory for the same year and nearly three millions under the estimate of the present study (18,673,000). In comparing the census statistics for 1906 and 1916, there are two possibilities which may be considered: the former might have been excessive and the latter nearer the true figure; or the former might have been near the true figure and the latter under the actual Catholic population of 1916. Either possibility would explain the apparent lack of growth during the decade.

There are two possibilities, it is true, but only one probability, the second one cited in the previous sentence. It is clear that the 1906 estimate of the census bureau is, if anything, under the true figure. It is equally clear that the Catholic population registered during the decade an increase greater than 10.6 per cent. The chief reason that can be advanced to explain the fact that the 1916 figure is an underestimate is the circumstances under which the statistics for that year were compiled. The compilation took place under the hysterical conditions of the World War, conditions particularly acute just after the entrance of America into the war in April, 1917. The first Church schedules were mailed by the bureau in January, 1917. At the end of June completed schedules had been received for more than half of all the Church organizations; at the end of October for more than four-fifths, and at the end of the calendar year 1917 for all but about three per cent, while for the remainder the collection continued until the end of March 1918.<sup>11</sup> It is plain that most of the schedules were completed after the United States was at war and it needs but little thought to see how the unsettled conditions of the time, together with the known departure of thousands of soldiers and workers from various parishes without their corresponding registration elsewhere, would tend to cause underestimates of the Catholic population.

When to this combination of reasonableness in holding the 1906 estimate at least not an overestimate, and the great probability that the 1916 estimate was an underestimate, there is added a closer investigation into the way in which such a slight increase as 10.6 per cent was registered during the decade, the logical soundness of this position is so apparent that the facts cannot in justice be denied.

A comparison of Government statistics for 1906 and 1916 makes it appear that the Catholic population of this country increased ten and six-tenths per cent during the decade. Were this small increase found to apply evenly, or approximately so, throughout the country, constant in all sections, with only occa-

<sup>11</sup> *Op. cit.*, Part I, p. 13.

sional fluctuations easily explainable by immigration, migration, or similar causes, the phenomenon would give us pause. It would be rather a venturesome procedure, under such circumstances, to attack the trustworthiness of data backed by practical unanimity of basis and result. The fact, however, is that an examination of State and divisional returns discloses a very marked variation of results; a peculiar lack of uniformity which is unexplainable by any causes which can be pointed to in the history of the Church during the decade.

Of the nine geographical divisions into which the census report divides the country,<sup>12</sup> two showed a loss during the decade; two showed a gain of less than ten per cent; four registered a gain of between ten and fifteen per cent; and one showed a gain above the latter figure. Of the states (including the District of Columbia), twenty indicated a loss; seventeen a gain of less than fifteen per cent; and twelve a gain of more than fifteen per cent. New York State, through which the vast majority of our immigrants enter the country and where a great proportion of them remain, shows on the face of the returns a gain of only two per cent in its Catholic population from all causes. Yet the neighboring state of New Jersey lays claim to a gain of fifty-two per cent. In the East North Central division, Michigan loses slightly, Wisconsin remains stationary, Illinois registers a very small gain, and Indiana and Ohio a substantial one. Further west, North Dakota gains thirty-three per cent, and South Dakota remains stationary. Louisiana, the home of the Creole, loses, we are told, nine per cent, as does Montana. Colorado lists a decrease of eleven per cent, while Arizona gains one hundred and forty-three per cent. Oregon's nineteen per cent decrease contrasts with California's nineteen per cent increase.

Further anomalies are brought to light in an examination of statistics for cities.<sup>13</sup> In Massachusetts, which, as a whole, recorded a gain, a loss of from three to thirty-three per cent is listed in Boston, Malden and Cambridge. Providence loses while Rhode Island gains. Cincinnati, Columbus and Dayton indicate losses of from six to twenty per cent while Ohio gains 28.6 per cent. Indianapolis and Evansville record alarming losses while Indiana gains 32.7 per cent. Springfield, Ill., loses twenty-three per cent, Peoria forty-eight per cent, Quincy sixty per cent, and yet the state registers a gain. It would be wearisome to detail all the examples which the tables afford.

This unevenness of results, the complete lack of that uniformity of growth which is to be expected at least in cities of the same state where conditions are similar, is so striking that one cannot

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Table XLIII for following data.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Tables XLV *seq.*

but question the Government statistics. The factors giving rise to Catholic increase were practically as constant from 1906 to 1916 as in any other decade. The financial flurry of 1907 retarded immigration, but hardly in any phenomenal manner; the outbreak of the World War in 1914 undoubtedly called many back to Europe for military service. It cannot be claimed, however, that these two factors were sufficient to cause an actual decrease of Catholic population in twenty states, in forty-six cities, for these two factors did not neutralize the large immigration while they could have little effect on the rate of natural increase. There is a complete absence of data corroborating these alleged losses.

The validity of the argument is further apparent from the fact that no such variability of results is to be detected in a comparison of the 1890 and 1906 statistics. During this period, with the one single exception of the State of Tennessee, no section of the country registered a decrease. On the contrary, a general average growth of close to one hundred per cent is verified in all the states and geographical divisions of the country. Statistics indicate that this was a reasonable growth. The probabilities are that the Government statistics for the 1906 Catholic population are themselves too small. All the factors of growth were operating from 1906 to 1916. One is forced to hold that the 1916 returns simply do not approximate the truth.

To indicate more concretely the peculiar vagaries of the phenomenon referred to, Table XLIII, giving details for all sections of the country (by geographical and political divisions, not by dioceses) presents a comparison of the Government statistics for 1906 and 1916.

This table is presented without further lengthy analysis. It will be seen that the statistics for the decade are uneven for every division. In New England, we are told that the fluctuation ranged from a loss of 18.5 in one state to a gain of thirty-seven per cent in another; in the Middle Atlantic division, from two to fifty-two per cent; in the East North Central, from a loss of 1.2 per cent to a gain of 32.7 per cent; in the West North Central, from a loss of nine to a gain of 33.3 per cent; in the South Atlantic, from a loss of 27.6 to a gain of 27.7 per cent; in the East South Central (the only one that is fairly consistent), from a loss of 24.5 per cent to a gain of 1.5 per cent; in the West South Central, from a loss of forty-five to a gain of eleven per cent; in the Mountain division, from a loss of twenty-seven to a gain of one hundred and forty-three per cent; and in the Pacific, from a loss of 19.5 per cent to a gain of nineteen per cent.

In order the better to bring out the anomalous conditions, Tables XLIV to XLVII take up more in detail the statistics for those states and cities which record a loss during the decade. The best

TABLE XLIII

*Per Cent Increase or Decrease of Catholic Population of the United States,  
by Geographical Divisions and States, according to United States  
Statistics, 1906 to 1916<sup>14</sup>*

The United States..... 10.6 per cent.

	Per cent		Per cent
New England .....	13.	West So. Central.....	— 2.4
Maine .....	11.3	Arkansas .....	— 45.
New Hampshire .....	— 4.	Louisiana .....	— 9.
Vermont .....	— 18.5	Oklahoma .....	9.
Massachusetts .....	11.	Texas .....	11.
Rhode Island .....	13.5		
Connecticut .....	37.	South Atlantic .....	9.
		Delaware .....	7.
Middle Atlantic .....	11.	Maryland .....	11.7
New York .....	2.	Dist. of Col. <sup>17</sup> .....	0.
New Jersey .....	52.	Virginia .....	9.
Pennsylvania .....	28.	West Virginia .....	27.7
		No. Carolina .....	.6
East No. Central.....	10.3	So. Carolina .....	— 27.6
Ohio .....	28.6	Georgia .....	— 18.
Indiana .....	32.7	Florida .....	20.
Illinois .....	6.8		
Michigan .....	— 1.2	Mountain .....	14.
Wisconsin <sup>15</sup> .....	0.	Montana .....	— 9.
		Idaho .....	— 14.
West No. Central.....	3.	Wyoming .....	6.
Minnesota .....	— 9.	Colorado .....	— 11.
Iowa .....	7.4	New Mexico .....	24.
Missouri .....	— 1.	Arizona .....	143.
North Dakota .....	33.3	Utah .....	2.
South Dakota <sup>16</sup> .....	0.	Nevada .....	— 27.
Nebraska .....	14.4		
Kansas .....	17.4	Pacific .....	17.4
		Washington .....	10.
East So. Central.....	— 16.	Oregon .....	— 19.5
Kentucky .....	— 18.	California .....	19.
Tennessee .....	1.5		
Alabama .....	— 24.5		
Mississippi .....	— 4.		

refutation of the allegations is presented in the tables—a comparison of the growth of parishes in the same states and cities during the period. It goes without saying that the, in some cases phenomenal, growth of parishes during the period is a sure proof that there was a healthy growth instead of a decrease in the Catholic population in the localities referred to.

<sup>14</sup> This table is compiled from data in *Religious Bodies*, 1916, Part I, p. 550. A minus sign indicates decrease.

<sup>15</sup> Increase from 594,428 to 594,836.

<sup>16</sup> Increase from 71,781 to 72,113.

<sup>17</sup> Decrease from 51,503 to 51,421.

TABLE XLIV<sup>18</sup>

*United States Statistics on Catholic Population, and Directory Statistics on Churches in Certain States for 1906 and 1916*

	Membership		Churches	
	1906	1916	1906	1916
Alabama .....	49,747	37,482	81	103
Arkansas .....	38,114	21,120	73	107
Colorado .....	117,435	104,982	157	221
District of Columbia	51,503	51,421	22	27
Georgia .....	22,674	18,214	31	56
Idaho .....	21,244	17,947	54	93
Kentucky .....	195,186	160,185	232	246
Louisiana .....	562,087	509,910	260	348
Michigan .....	578,982	572,117	478	585
Minnesota .....	445,045	415,664	548	674
Mississippi .....	33,619	32,160	78	110
Missouri .....	450,167	445,352	426	492
Montana .....	85,128	78,113	86	187
Nevada .....	11,729	8,742	26	27
New Hampshire ...	141,015	136,020	97	109
North Carolina ....	4,684	4,989	36	59
South Carolina ....	12,138	9,514	29	33
South Dakota ....	71,781	72,113	192	310
Utah .....	9,831	10,000	5	13
Vermont .....	96,791	78,178	95	103
Wisconsin .....	594,428	594,836	680	755
Wyoming .....	12,075	12,801	18	41
 Total.....	 3,605,403	 3,391,860	 3,697	 4,699

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *Religious Bodies*, 1916, Part I, p. 550. Directory statistics for this and the three following tables are taken from the *Catholic Directory* for 1907 and 1917.

The total decrease alleged for seventeen of these states amounts to 215,483, while the other five show a combined increase of only 1,940. The net "decrease" in the twenty-two states listed (nearly one-half of all the states of the nation) is 213,543. As mentioned previously, in only one state (Tennessee) was a decrease (822 persons) indicated for the period from 1890 to 1906, nor in fact did any other states, with practically no exception, even merely register so slight an increase that it would be equivalent to a loss. Contrasting with the decrease of 213,543 members, as alleged by the Government statistics, there was a general gain of twenty-seven per cent in the number of churches throughout the states in question, according to the statistics of the Catholic Directory.<sup>19</sup> Certainly the lack of an increase in the number of churches would

<sup>19</sup> Referring to the use of defective lists by the Government, the bureau listed in the twenty-two states of Table XLIV, only 4,522 churches, in comparison with the 4,699 of the Directory, for the year 1916. *Op. cit.*, Part II, p. 655. This, of course, increases the margin of error appreciably.

by no means indicate a lack of growth in membership; but it cannot be controverted that a general growth in the number of churches does indicate an even greater proportionate growth in membership. It may happen in a particular case that the subdivision of a parish neither is due to nor causes an increase in population. Usually, however, it is found that the subdivision of a parish, if it cannot be said that it actually increases the population, does disclose the presence of a larger Catholic population than was thought previously to be in the locality, while a certain real increase comes also through the return of the strayed sheep who so often come home to a new parish,<sup>20</sup> and through added converts who are apt to come in in large numbers when it happens that the Catholic church is the first church to be established in a hitherto "unchurched" neighborhood.

A similar investigation of certain cities, not necessarily situated in the twenty-two states treated of in the preceding table, leads to the same results. The three following tables set forth statistics for forty-six cities ranging in population from 25,000 to several million inhabitants, in all of which the Government statistics posit a loss in Catholic membership between 1906 and 1916.

In these three tables statistics are presented for forty-six cities in which the Catholic population is supposed to have decreased 358,608 between 1906 and 1916, according to Government statistics. It will be noticed, upon examination, that only eighteen of these cities are located in the states treated of in Table XLIV. The fact that the other twenty-eight cities are in states which showed some increase gives an insight into the reason why the recorded increase was often so small.

It is unnecessary to prove that such losses did not occur for the increase in parishes in all the cities concerned precludes that possibility, as does also the complete lack of concrete evidence to that effect. To defend the proposition that the Catholic population of these cities really did decrease would be preposterous. The Church officials in the city of New York would not be founding sixty-two new parishes while losing 118,000 members; one would not find an increase of sixteen per cent in the number of parishes

<sup>20</sup> An illuminating instance of how the subdivision of a parish discloses the presence of Catholics not hitherto listed was related to the writer by a bishop, now deceased, whose name, for obvious reasons, is withheld. A certain parish with a membership of about 2,000 souls was subdivided into two. In a very short time each parish reported a membership of between 1,500 and 2,000 members. Another new parish, and finally a fourth, having been carved out of the original territory, it was found at the end that each of the four still had practically as many members as the original mother parish had at the start of the process. The case, which is by no means uncommon, illustrates clearly how the tendency to underestimate results. That it is not an isolated example almost any priest of experience can testify.

TABLE XLV<sup>21</sup>

*United States Statistics on Catholic Population, and Directory Statistics on Parishes, 1906 and 1916, in certain Cities of over 100,000 Population in 1910*

	Membership		Parishes	
	1906	1916	1906	1916
Albany .....	45,345	39,769	15	16
Boston .....	304,631	294,914	52	63
Cambridge .....	38,874	28,206	5	8
Cincinnati .....	124,954	101,931	45	60
Columbus .....	33,409	31,948	16	19
Dayton .....	29,305	26,923	12	17
Denver .....	30,580	28,772	13	22
Indianapolis .....	36,884	31,601	13	17
Louisville .....	100,200	53,474	36	41
Minneapolis .....	53,696	51,776	17	27
Nashville .....	6,900	5,845	6	7
New Orleans .....	174,799	147,696	34	40
New York .....	1,663,265	1,545,562	264	326
Portland, O. ....	20,919	20,113	14	16
Providence .....	118,028	111,525	21	25
St. Paul .....	85,764	63,321	23	28
Scranton .....	54,984	54,443	20	24
Washington .....	51,503	51,421	22	27
Total.....	2,974,040	2,689,240	628	783 <sup>22</sup>

Total "decrease": 284,800; gain in parishes: 24.7 per cent.

TABLE XLVI

*United States Statistics on Catholic Population, and Directory Statistics on Parishes, 1906 and 1916, in Certain Cities having 50,000 to 100,000 Population 1910<sup>23</sup>*

	Membership		Parishes	
	1906	1916	1906	1916
Charleston .....	7,602	6,443	5	6
Covington .....	22,662	17,780	9	10
Dallas .....	9,284	6,933	5	8
Evansville .....	17,660	11,592	6	9
Fort Worth .....	5,100	5,870	2	5
Houston .....	13,743	14,322	5	7
Mobile .....	13,579	12,233	8	9
Norfolk .....	4,029	4,100	3	3
Peoria .....	17,413	9,837	9	9
Saginaw .....	10,355	11,086	7	9
Savannah .....	6,843	6,099	4	5
Springfield, Ill. ....	13,175	9,450	5	9
Terre Haute .....	4,829	5,531	4	4
Yonkers .....	38,016	30,620	10	15
Total .....	184,290	151,896	82	108

Total "decrease": 31,394; Parish increase: 31.7 per cent.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *op. cit.*, Part I, pp. 123 *seq.*

<sup>22</sup> It is clear that the Directory statistics on the number of churches and parishes are accurate in the sense that they do not overestimate.

<sup>23</sup> *Op. cit.*, Part I, pp. 351 *seq.* and corresponding table in *Religious Bodies*, 1906.

TABLE XLVII

*United States Statistics on Catholic Population, and Directory Statistics on Parishes, 1906 and 1916, in Certain Cities having 25,000 to 50,000 Population 1910<sup>24</sup>*

	Membership		Parishes	
	1906	1916	1906	1916
Augusta, Ga. ....	3,739	3,105	2	3
Butte ....	22,000	12,750	4	5
Dubuque ....	17,137	16,051	8	9
Galveston ....	14,872	11,299	5	5
La Crosse ....	12,372	9,096	7	8
Lincoln ....	5,887	2,674	3	4
Little Rock ....	5,256	3,101	5	7
Malden ....	10,923	8,955	2	2
Montgomery ....	3,006	1,806	1	3
Pueblo ....	12,446	11,498	5	8
Quincy, Ill. ....	20,400	8,500	6	6
Sacramento ....	6,800	7,700	3	6
Superior ....	10,844	6,530	5	9
York ....	2,472	2,675	2	4
Total ....	148,154	105,740	58	79

Total "decrease": 42,414; Parish increase: 36 per cent.

in the city of Louisville and a decrease in membership of forty-seven per cent (from 100,000 to 53,000) at the same time; one would not reasonably expect to record a decrease to twenty per cent in the Catholic population of Cincinnati and an increase of thirty-three per cent in the number of parishes; it is unbelievable that the Catholic city of New Orleans would lose 27,000 Catholics in ten years.

In view of all the data adduced, the theory of a loss must be rejected. The only other alternative by which to defend the 1916 statistics would be to hold the 1906 statistics too high. Such a procedure is also unacceptable as has been indicated previously.<sup>25</sup>

The final conclusion to be drawn from a study of the data adduced in Tables XLIII to XLVII is that the true rate of increase has not been applied in the Government statistics as presented in 1916. The lack of a healthy increase, the presence of indicated losses so general throughout the country, point to the conclusion that the Government estimate of 15,722,000 as the Catholic popula-

<sup>24</sup> *Op. cit.*, Part I, pp. 352 seq. and corresponding table in *Religious Bodies*, 1906.

<sup>25</sup> A possible, at least partial, explanation, apart from those already given, of the reason why these city statistics are so unsatisfactory is the fact that city pastors are unable to be in such close personal touch with their parishioners as are country pastors and hence more apt to underestimate. Consider also the fluctuation of parochial population through removal in and out of parishes, arrival and departure of migrants and immigrants, etc.

tion in 1916 is far under the actual population of that year. If we admit the approximate accuracy of the official estimate for 1906—14,210,000—in the sense that it is certainly not too high, being probably somewhat under the true figure—and, as has been seen, this is reasonably to be admitted—and if we apply a reasonable rate of growth during the ten years following, we will find that the 1916 Catholic population must have been somewhere around 18,500,000 at least. That these 18,500,000 would have increased to approximately 20,000,000 by the year 1920 cannot be doubted, and this accordingly is the estimate here adopted of the actual Catholic population at the end of the century under discussion. A comparison of the supposititious and the actual Catholic population according to estimates for recent years, a brief summary of the main points submitted in the present chapter, is presented for ready reference, in the following table:

TABLE XLVIII

*Estimates of Catholic Population of United States, for recent Years, compared*

Year	Estimates of Actual Catholic Population			
	Theoretical This Work	Cath. Directory	U. S. Gov't	Corrected Figures
1890 .....	8,909,000	7,855,000	7,331,000	9,000,000 *
1900 .....	12,041,000	10,774,939	.....	.....
1906 .....	14,600,000	13,089,353	14,210,755	14,500,000
1910 .....	16,363,000	14,618,761	.....	.....
1916 .....	18,673,000	17,022,879	15,721,815	18,500,000
1920 .....	20,000,000	17,885,000	.....	20,000,000

\* This is less by 1,000,000 than the estimate which the Catholic Directory for 1890 advanced in rejecting the estimate of 7,855,000 which was based on incomplete returns.

To many the proof of the fact presented in the preceding pages that the 1920 Catholic population was not less than 20,000,000 will perhaps be unacceptable. It may be alleged that the writer is guilty of special pleading, that he has allowed his feelings to outweigh his judgment. To anticipate and answer such a possible allegation, and to prove how very conservative is the reasoning of the present chapter, as well as the results arrived at, recourse is had to an independent calculation made by a non-Catholic, a Government statistician. His estimate is that the Catholic population of the United States in the year 1920 was 23,000,000.<sup>26</sup> He contends that the estimate by the census bureau of the Catholic

<sup>26</sup> Cf. article, by E. A. Goldenweiser (statistician of the Federal Reserve Board), written for, and sent out by, the N. C. W. C. news service in July, 1922. It appeared in many Catholic newspapers and magazines. Cf. the *New World*, Chicago, July 28, 1922, p. 1.

population of 1916 as 15,721,815 "includes only persons for whom there is a record of actual membership in the church and certainly does not comprise all persons of Roman Catholic faith in the United States."<sup>27</sup>

Proceeding, he discusses first the statistics for sex. Of the total number of Catholics, 12,569,395 were reported by sex. Of this number, 6,149,035 were males and 6,420,360 females, the percentages being 48.9 and 51.1 respectively. This ratio is not reasonable for the general ratio of the sexes in the United States in 1910 was 106.2 males to 100 females, the probable ratio in 1916 being 105 to 100. The ratio among immigrants was much higher. At the ratio of 105 to 100 there should be 8,435,539 males to correspond to the 8,033,847 females (51.1 per cent of the 1916 total as estimated). This correction would give a total of 16,469,386.

In addition to this correction by sex another correction by age is made. The census estimated the number of Catholics under 13 years of age as 3,924,402 or twenty-five per cent of the total. The general condition for the United States in 1920 was that those under 13 constituted 38.8 per cent of those over 13 years of age. To the 11,797,413 Catholics over 13 years of age would correspond then 4,577,396 children under 13 or 652,994 more than are given in the census report. Adding this to the figures corrected for sex distribution, the article continues, we obtain an estimated total of 17,122,380, "as the rock bottom minimum of what could be considered as the total Catholic population of the United States" in 1916.

The author of the article holds, however, that even this is certainly too low, since the correction for both sex and age was entirely too low for Catholics. He also raises a third point—the ratio of members of a faith to members of a church and by analogy from statistics for Canada and a comparison of the respective ratios on this point for Protestants and Catholics there, comes to the conclusion that the ratio in the United States for Catholics will be "1.33 Catholics per one member of the Church, which appears to be a conservative estimate as it assumes that three-fourths of all Catholics are church members."

He concludes as follows:

<sup>27</sup> The fact that Mr. Goldenweiser is in error in thinking that the estimate "includes only (*i.e.*, "all and no other") persons for whom there is a record of actual membership"—the error lying in the implication that the returns from pastors were returns of actual membership, and that these returns accounted therefore for *all* actual members (which as we have seen is not the case)—does not derogate from the validity of his general reasoning, or the plausible acceptability of his conclusions. Rather does it strengthen his conclusion since here are some unenumerated Catholics whom he did not conceive of as such.

The number of Roman Catholics in the United States is certainly larger than the number of Catholic church members enumerated by the census of religious bodies. This number, 15,721,815, would be increased about 1,400,000 merely through the process of building up the families of church members on the basis of age and sex distribution of the total population of the United States. But even the adjusted figure is clearly incomplete, as there is no reason to believe that even substantially all the persons belonging to the faith are included among church members. By comparing the United States figures with those available for Canada, where both the number of church members and of persons professing each faith are available, the conclusion is reached that Catholics constitute not less than 21 per cent of the population of the United States and that 23,000,000 is a reasonable estimate of their number.

While some of the statements in the article referred to may be debatable, and while the present writer neither agrees with all that is said nor is willing to accept in its entirety the full conclusion, yet it cannot be denied that the article is plausible and without bias. It corroborates the conclusion that the Catholic population of the United States in 1920 was at least 20,000,000.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>28</sup> E. V. O'Hara, "Growth of the Catholic Church in the United States, 1906-1916," in *America*, vol. XXVI, Mar. 18, 1922, and "Slow Increase of the Catholic Population," *ib.*, March 25, 1922 (this second paper was utilized by the *Literary Digest*, May 20, 1922, in an article: "Why Catholic Growth Hesitates") accepts the Government statistics without questioning or analyzing them.

Gustavus Myers, "Is the Church on a Decline?" *Current History Magazine*, vol. XIV, Sept., 1921, accepts them also in giving an analysis of this question from the Protestant point of view, following Dr. Walter Laidlaw's report to the War Department for the allotment of army chaplains.

Mr. Lewis Meriam, a non-Catholic, formerly with the Census Bureau, puts forth a computation similar to that made by Mr. Goldenweiser. He takes exception to the Laidlaw report which is based on the 1916 religious statistics of the Government and holds that the Catholic population is at the lowest estimate 21.5 per cent and actually somewhere between that figure and 32.4 per cent of the total population—that is somewhere between 22,500,000 and 34,000,000.

Cf. *N. C. W. C.* news bulletin, Feb. 6, 1922.

Cf. also "The Catholic Population and the Catholic Directory," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, vol. LIV, March, 1916.

Rev. John Eliot Ross, C.S.P., comes to the conclusion that the 1924 Catholic population of the United States was 25,000,000. Cf. *Baltimore Catholic Review*, July 19, 1924, p. 1.

## CHAPTER XIII

### THE ANSWER TO THE QUESTION

Has the numerical growth of the Catholic Church in the United States during the past century been commensurate with the two ordinary factors of natural increase and conversion and also with the extraordinary factor, immigration? This question, presented to the reader in the opening chapter, may now be rather definitely answered. The somewhat intricate computation set forth in the decadal tables called for a Catholic population of 20,000,000 souls to be accounted for in the year 1920. The preceding evaluation and correction of contemporary estimates of the actual Catholic population in that year led to the conclusion that there were actually 20,000,000 Catholics in the United States in 1920. The actual and the theoretical Catholic population coincide. The conclusion that presents itself is that the vast Catholic immigration into the United States throughout the past century has been successfully assimilated and retained by the American Church. The answer to the question is an affirmative: the growth of the Church in the United States has been commensurate with the ordinary factors of natural increase and conversion, and with the extraordinary factor of immigration. Put negatively, the conclusion is that there has been no loss during the century. However, it would be somewhat misleading to express the conclusion in this bald and simple form. To be rightly understood it needs explanation and qualification.

The first point which needs explanation is the extension of the term "Catholic," for much of the validity of the reasoning involved throughout this study depends on the meaning signified and connoted by this term. The principle "once a Catholic, always a Catholic," in the sense that an apostate Catholic cannot profit by his apostasy to claim, thereafter, exemption from the laws of the Church, is a recognized principle of canon law. Its most concrete application is found in the relation of the marriage laws of the Church to such persons, for they are still bound by canonical impediments and regulations, including especially the form to be observed in the celebration of marriage, the latter, to mention the most obvious, binding under pain of invalidity.<sup>1</sup> The consequence

<sup>1</sup> For a comprehensive understanding of the further connotation of this principle cf. *Codex Juris Canonici*, cc. 13, 750, 751, 1065, 1066, 1070, 1099, and 1325, and commentaries on same.

is that from the strictly canonical point of view anyone who has ever been a Catholic remains a Catholic to the day of his death.<sup>2</sup>

However, the canonical meaning of the term does not agree with the popular meaning ascribed to it by Catholics and non-Catholics alike, nor is it the one adopted in the present study when enumerating Catholics. In popular phraseology an apostate Catholic ceases to be a Catholic although even in ordinary language the meaning is usually qualified among Catholics by such statements as : "He ought to be a Catholic," or "He is a fallen-away Catholic." Although the popular term always excludes apostates, it has otherwise a wide range of meaning.

This is determined by the varying criteria taken by different persons as the basis of classification in deciding whether one is or is not a Catholic according to popular acceptance. The criteria, in turn, are practically always the degrees of fidelity to Catholic principles and practice as observed in the actual life of a person whose status is to be determined. Finally, the adoption of a particular criterion in preference to others, whether the adoption be conscious or unconscious, depends in great measure upon the position, duties, attitude, outlook on life, character and disposition, or lack of any or all of them, on the part of the person adopting the criterion. The pastor, in charge of souls as he is, is apt to adopt a stricter criterion and to demand for qualification as a Catholic a higher degree of fidelity in the reception of the sacraments and the fulfillment of the commandments of the Church.<sup>3</sup> The pious lay Catholic will adopt a criterion slightly less rigorous. The ordinary Catholic is more lenient in his interpretation ; the lax Catholic is apt to be lax in the qualifications which he demands ; the negligent or even totally indifferent Catholic, providing he be not formally an apostate, will generally consider himself a Catholic, although perhaps debarred from that category by all others except those in his own class. Finally, the European, according to an impression current in America, usually adopts a less strict interpretation of the term than does the American.

What of the statistician? What criterion should he adopt in his enumeration of Catholics? What, concretely, is the criterion adopted in the present work? To interpret in concrete terms the possibilities referred to in the preceding paragraph one might demand as qualifications for classification as a Catholic: (1) that

<sup>2</sup> The single exception noted in canon 1070, No. 2, whereby a child of non-Catholic parents, baptized in the Catholic faith, but brought up from very infancy in heresy, schism, infidelity or no religion at all, is not bound by the Catholic form of celebration of marriage when marrying a non-Catholic, does not militate against the general proposition presented here.

<sup>3</sup> What is said here refers to the pastor when officially estimating or actually enumerating the Catholics in his parish. Outside of his official capacity the pastor usually adopts a much less strict criterion.

the person attend Mass regularly on Sundays, receive the sacraments frequently, and contribute, according to ability, to the support of the Church;<sup>4</sup> (2) that one frequently be present at Sunday and holyday Mass, and receive the sacraments at least at Easter time, or even only once a year, though it be not at the prescribed time for the reception of Holy Communion; (3) that one, though not fulfilling regularly the obligation of hearing Mass on Sundays and holydays, at least receive the sacraments once a year, the three numbers including, of course, the fulfillment of the obligation to bring up one's children in the Catholic faith; (4) that one, though not fulfilling the obligation of hearing Mass on Sundays and holydays, and the precept of paschal Communion, yet fulfill the laws of the Church regarding the reception of baptism (for the children), the sacrament of marriage, and holy Viaticum; (5) that one, though never attending Mass or receiving the sacraments or bringing up the children in the faith, send for the priest when dying.

In making choice of a criterion it must be apparent that No. 1 is to be rejected as too rigid and strict, for many really good Catholics would otherwise be barred out. It is equally clear that No. 5 is entirely too lax as a criterion, for whatever be the death of a person we can judge only by externals, and nothing in the life of such a person could possibly postulate that he be classified as a Catholic, even though baptized in the Church, any more than the numerous non-Catholics, in life recognized as such, who may receive the grace of final conversion. It is plain also that all will agree that those who have the qualifications mentioned in Nos. 2 or 3, and naturally, *a fortiori*, the varying degrees possible under the first three numbers, whatever is to be said of the conduct of the laxer ones, are universally held to be Catholics.

The discussion comes on those included under No. 4. Should they be enumerated as Catholics? Have they been enumerated as such in the present study? The answer to the first question is somewhat debatable. Their Catholicity is certainly diluted and the ordinary pastor will hesitate long before enumerating them as Catholics when he takes a census or quasi-census, and his action may be quite justified, at least in certain cases, when, for example, the division of a parish may depend on the result or when there is question of a per capita tax. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that they still retain a certain minimum of Catholicity sufficient to entitle them to the name Catholic in a broad sense.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> It must not be inferred that this text is meant to imply that pastors officially hold such a criterion. The purpose here is merely to set forth what would be the maximum possible criterion.

<sup>5</sup> Reference is chiefly to persons of this character in the article of Mr. Goldenweiser, quoted in the preceding chapter, in making the distinction between members of the faith and members of the Church.

Hence, though the pastor does not, and justly so, officially consider them as Catholics, it may be that the statistician might include them justly enough in his enumeration. It is an admitted fact that there are many such diluted Catholics and especially among our immigrants. If they were lukewarm, minimum Catholics in their own country, and yet were enumerated as Catholics there despite this fact, then the American statistician must enumerate them as Catholics here. Otherwise, to apply a lax criterion in Europe and a strict criterion here would be unscientific, misleading and unjust. Especially would it be unjust to the American Church since a loss which really did not occur here would be charged to it. The answer, therefore, is that the statistician must enumerate them as Catholics if they are here merely what they were at home.<sup>6</sup>

It is true that a person going to a strange land, thrown among a strange people, forced to adopt new customs, presented perhaps with new freedom, confronted with new duties and obligations, and without the influence of family ties and motherly or conjugal advice to guide him by the pitfalls of his new life (and all these circumstances are verified in the case of many of our immigrants), is apt to drift away from the practices of his religion. This fact is often only too well illustrated in the movement of the youth of our country from the rural communities to the city. This is all very true, but most of those immigrants who are identified as minimum Catholics were already such before they embarked for America. The majority, in some cases the vast majority, of our immigrants are men.<sup>7</sup> Now, it is precisely the male European Catholic who is apt to be lax in the fulfillment of his religious duties. He is called a Catholic in Europe. The American statistician must enumerate him here as a Catholic.

In the present study, therefore, we enumerate as Catholics all who at least fulfill the precepts of the Church in regard to baptism, marriage and holy Viaticum.<sup>8</sup> By this criterion there should be in 1920, 20,000,000 Catholics in the United States; by this criterion there were, without any doubt, that many here.<sup>9</sup> As a

<sup>6</sup> Natives of this status must also be enumerated for similar reasons; because they are, after all, at least minimum Catholics, not having definitely severed the ties that bind them to the Church; and because of the practical impossibility of ascertaining their number were it decided to omit them from the enumeration.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Table II.

<sup>8</sup> The application of the third point (holy Viaticum) is, of course, rather theoretical. Practically it can be held that those who observe the Church law in regard to matrimony, and who have their children baptized and given at least the minimum of Catholic education will call for the priest when they are dying.

<sup>9</sup> This is precisely the criterion used in estimating the proposition of Catholics in the European populations and hence among our immigrants. Cf. Chap. VII.

final remark, if one objects to this criterion, the objection can easily be admitted, but it is necessary to insist, for the sake of fairness and scientific accuracy, that in estimating the supposititious population and in enumerating the actual population the same criterion, whatever it be, must be used. If deduction be thus made it must affect both the supposititious and the actual Catholic population, and the two will still agree.

In conclusion it may be asked how many of our 20,000,000 belong in the category of minimum Catholics. It is hardly fair to venture an estimate: it might be as low as 500,000; it might be as high as 1,000,000. It is certain, of course, that not all can be classed as immigrants nor even strictly as immigrational stock; it is certain, however, that most of them are immigrants, or of immigrational stock, precisely because the vast majority of American Catholics are of immigrational stock. On the other hand, it is evident from the following tables that the proportion of such Catholics among immigrants is most surely not so high as a rather general, but rather unfair, impression would have it.

TABLE XLIX<sup>10</sup>

*Catholic Churches, and Membership, using a foreign Language alone or with English, in 1916*

Language	Alone		With English		Total	
	Churches	Member- ship	Churches	Member- ship	Churches	Member- ship
German .....	206	191,347	1,684	1,481,343	1,890	1,672,690
Spanish .....	530	378,748	311	273,496	841	552,244
Polish .....	466	1,165,064	269	260,129	735	1,425,193
French .....	200	478,255	499	548,711	699	1,026,966 <sup>11</sup>
Italian .....	149	420,511	327	1,095,307	476	1,515,818
Bohemian ...	76	67,827	102	66,084	178	133,911
Slavic .....	98	106,927	15	11,337	113	118,264
Slovak .....	69	78,447	40	47,240	109	125,687
Lithuanian ...	87	140,144	9	10,133	96	150,277
Magyar .....	32	44,404	16	21,911	48	66,315
Portuguese ..	19	52,444	34	34,670	53	87,114
Ruthenian ...	44	49,475	1	1,817	45	51,292
Slovenian ....	29	42,477	38	51,519	67	93,996
Syrian .....	17	8,705	3	5,482	20	14,187
Croatian ....	14	33,419	5	9,374	19	42,793
Dutch .....	19	20,223	..	....	19	20,223
Roumanian ..	6	6,613	2	5,200	8	11,813

Tables XLIX and L must be used with caution, for one not on his guard can easily draw most incorrect conclusions from them. In the first place the statistics are Government data for

<sup>10</sup> Compiled from data in *Religious Bodies*, 1916, Part II, p. 654, and Part I, pp. 81 and 82.

<sup>11</sup> Chiefly French Canadians, not French.

TABLE L<sup>12</sup>

*Catholic Churches, and Membership, using more than one foreign Language, exclusively, or with English, in 1916*

Languages	Exclusively		Total exc. and with English	
	Churches	Members	Churches	Members
Arabic & Syrian .....	11	5,487	13	6,462
Bohemian & German.....	11	11,216	61	38,522
Croatian & Slavic .....	3	4,900	3	4,900
French & German .....	2	1,600	59	39,596
French & Italian .....	1	1,143	14	24,827
French & Polish .....	2	570	17	17,226
French, German & Italian..	..	....	9	19,619
French, Italian & Spanish..	..	....	2	7,600
German & Italian.....	2	8,569	19	52,269
German & Lithuanian.....	1	5,000	1	5,000
German & Magyar.....	3	1,993	6	5,499
German & Polish.....	2	877	34	24,039
German & Spanish.....	5	2,583	16	9,848
Italian & Polish.....	1	75	15	12,117
Italian & Portuguese.....	..	....	7	10,648
Italian & Slovenian.....	1	600	3	6,200
Italian & Spanish.....	..	....	3	5,120
Italian, Lithuanian, Magyar	..	....	1	7,550
Italian, Lithuanian, Polish.	1	559	2	5,932
Lithuanian & Polish.....	9	12,425	13	16,571
Magyar & Ruthenian.....	4	4,900	4	4,900
Magyar & Slavic.....	6	6,472	12	9,910
Polish & Slavic.....	5	6,700	10	11,289
Polish & Slovak.....	3	590	7	5,990
Ruthenian & Slavic.....	24	22,918	24	22,918

1916 and as such are undoubtedly defective. No correction of them, obviously, is possible here but nevertheless some general conclusions can be drawn. Secondly, one must guard against errors, such as thinking that the use even exclusively of a foreign language in a church posits that all the parishioners are of the nationality indicated; or holding the belief that all who use a foreign language and fulfill their religious duties are enumerated in these two tables, for many foreigners attend churches using English exclusively; or concluding all enumerated in the above tables are foreigners or their children, for many Americans attend national parish churches.

Avoiding these errors, and this very process makes many specific conclusions impossible, it can be argued in a general way that the statistics tabulated indicate a very gratifying and consistent tendency on the part of our immigrants to hold the faith. A comparison with the number of foreign born in 1920 (Table

<sup>12</sup> Compiled from data in *Religious Bodies*, 1916, Part I, pp. 81 seq. Only totals of 5,000 or over are given, there being a large number of others under that figure.

XXXV), bearing in mind the safeguards mentioned above, strengthens the conclusion materially. Finally it must be noted that a small proportion of a given nationality—as for example the Germans—using their native language does not necessarily indicate laxness in fulfillment of religious duties. This phenomenon is always found among the older immigration due to the Americanization of the members.<sup>13</sup>

The preceding tables do not give complete statistics on the subject treated of, the intention being merely to give statistics for the leading languages and combinations of languages. Totals, according to the Government, were as follows: Of the 17,487 Catholic organizations (parishes) reporting, 11,411, with 8,044,644 members, reported the use of English only; and 6,076 with 7,677,171 members, reported the use of foreign languages exclusively, or in connection with English, and of these, 2,230 organizations, with 3,306,439 members, used foreign languages only. The total number of foreign languages reported was 27.<sup>14</sup>

To throw light on the question as to how widespread is membership in Protestant churches on the part of immigrants from Catholic countries the following table presents statistics on this point for Italians. This nationality is chosen because it is the most easily computed, and statistics for it are clearer and lead more easily to a true conclusion. Other Catholic countries—as Spain, Belgium, France, Portugal—have sent so few immigrants, and in their case so many other circumstances enter in, that it is useless to quote statistics for them. Ireland cannot, naturally, be studied for the point of language, because of the number of Protestants there and because of the use of English by the Irish. Poland and Austria-Hungary cannot be cited, because of the large number of non-Catholics in both and, especially in the latter case, because of the large number of tongues.

It is apparent, then, according to Table LI that only a very negligible number of Italians are enrolled in Protestant churches in this country, there being 202 Protestant churches with a total of 53,073 members (an average of 262 members to a church) using Italian either alone or with English.<sup>15</sup> Naturally many of

<sup>13</sup> For this particular nationality, moreover, at the time of gathering the statistics (1917) there were many reasons why the numbers would be minimized.

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.*, Part II, p. 654. It must be remembered that these totals are open to criticism, especially because of the attitude toward foreigners at the time when the statistics were gathered. The totals moreover do not include organizations and membership using more than one foreign language exclusively or with English, and the totals for these are large as can be seen from Table L. As for the inaccuracy of the statistics, they allege that between 1906 and 1916 there was a decrease of 298,780 Catholics using foreign languages exclusively (*op. cit.*, I, p. 83). The decrease is not very probable.

<sup>15</sup> The probabilities are that these statistics are more accurate than the Catholic statistics.

these were Protestants when they came here. Many have been misled by underhanded dealings into believing their church is a Catholic one;<sup>16</sup> very few can be considered as formal apostates.

TABLE LI<sup>17</sup>

*Protestant Churches, and Membership, using Italian exclusively or with English, 1916*

Sects	Churches	Membership
Adventists .....	2	183
Baptists .....	30	8,147
Brethren .....	1	65
Christadelphians .....	1	18
Congregational .....	7	669
Evangelical Ass'n .....	4	185
Independent churches .....	3	988
Lutheran .....	2	181
Methodist .....	54	8,505
Old Catholic .....	4	7,475
Presbyterian .....	69	20,092
Prot. Episcopal .....	21	5,411
Reformed bodies .....	3	1,122
Salvation Army .....	1	32
 Total .....	 202	 53,073

Summing up in a final statement the connotations of the conclusion that in 1920 the supposititious, and the actual, Catholic population of the United States was 20,000,000, the following propositions may be advanced as safe, valid, logical, and even incontrovertible conclusions to be drawn from the data presented in this study of a subject, so long neglected, so widely misunderstood, and, too, often so wildly misinterpreted.

1. It is absolutely certain that there has been no enormous loss to the faith (that is, a loss of ten, fifteen, twenty or thirty million Catholics) because of immigration to the United States during the past century.

2. There is no evidence of even an appreciable or measurable loss (two, three, five millions) during the period.

3. It is very probable that there has been no loss at all, beyond that defection of Catholics which ordinarily takes place among any population, due to the weakness of human nature and the usual manifestations of the same.

4. If the Catholic immigration of the past century had not

<sup>16</sup> Statues, altars, candles and similar appurtenances are used by certain sects, in their "Italian missions," to entrap the unwary and the ignorant. Cf. Palmieri, "Italian Protestantism in the U. S. A., in *Catholic World*, vol. CVII, 1918. *Idem*, "Contribution of Italian Clergy to U. S.," in *Catholic Builders of the Nation*, vol. II.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *op. cit.*, Part I, pp. 78 seq.

## 222 HAS THE IMMIGRANT KEPT THE FAITH?

taken place, the Church in the United States, scattered over the immense expanse of the nation, would very probably today be a replica of the Church of 1790, a weak, anemic body, by the very force of circumstances unable to conquer the insuperable, chiefly physical, obstacles which would prevent her growth.

5. It is due to immigration that the Catholic Church in America today stands out among her sister Churches of other nations, the equal of any, if not indeed superior to all, in loyalty, vitality, fidelity and stability.

## CHAPTER XIV

### ALLEGED CATHOLIC LOSSES

The conclusions advanced in the preceding chapter as propositions to be logically deduced from the data presented in this study run counter to what is practically the accepted tradition in the American Church. Statements have been made from time to time throughout the century, alleging that the American Church has proved a failure; that she has failed to assimilate the Catholic immigrants who come to America; that Catholicity has lost in this way ten, fifteen, twenty, twenty-five, even thirty million souls (accounts vary) in the persons of immigrants and their descendants. The repetition and reiteration of these allegations has resulted in the fact that a pessimistic view of the growth of the church is rather common. Not all are willing to believe that we have lost thirty millions; but very many are of the opinion that we have lost from five to ten millions. The general impression is that the charges are justified; hesitancy comes only on the amount. Although many of these allegations are, in themselves, because so preposterous and unwarranted, unworthy of serious study and refutation, yet, because at times they have deceived "even the elect," it is necessary to consider them, as well as other more plausible charges, in the present chapter. It is in order, therefore, to proceed to a detailed study, analysis, and refutation of these various allegations referred to, for although the validity of the present conclusions is amply proved by the mass of data that support them, yet one might think that these charges, so contradictory to the conclusions, are based also on statistics and the result might be an impasse. While the validity of the conclusions does not depend on a refutation of these charges, their acceptability does to a certain extent. The refutation happens to be a very simple process, since, with no exception, the proponents of the charges referred to have failed to give any statistics at all (and extant data answer them fully), or they have put forth as statistics figures which are not at all in agreement with official data. If one ask why this disregard of, or failure to resort to, statistics, the answer is, again without exception, to be found in the fact that the proponents were guilty of special pleading. Each had a special point in view—in no case was it a straight study of the growth of the Church—and each allowed his views to color his

statistics. Finally, practically without exception, all since 1840 have based themselves on the original statement of Bishop England, so that in a certain sense the numerous charges are really only one, or developments of the same.

### I. BISHOP ENGLAND'S STATEMENT

Almost the first assertion of Catholic loss in this country, an assertion which has received probably the widest circulation of all, which has almost without exception passed at its face value among later writers, and which has in fact become, as it were, the foundation stone of all later claims of a similar nature, is the famous statement of Bishop England of Charleston (South Carolina) made in 1836, to the effect that in the previous fifty years the Catholic Church in America had suffered a loss of three million and three-quarters.

In a communication to the central council for the Propagation of the Faith at Lyons, sent from Rome in 1836, the Bishop has the following to say in response to some inquiries which had been addressed to him:

Your questions require in some instances (1) precise details which I cannot undertake to give you from this place;<sup>1</sup> where the documents from which they may be furnished are not within my reach; nor do I think that I could anywhere procure exact returns such as you desire. . . . I have been long under the (2) impression that not only in Europe but even in the United States, very delusive fancies have been entertained of the progress of the Catholic Church in our Union, and even many mistakes as to the means most conducive to its propagation. I have no (3) doubt upon my mind that within fifty years millions have been lost to the Catholic Church in the United States nor do I believe that the fact has been sufficiently brought into notice, nor the proper remedies applied to correct this evil.

. . . To anyone who for a moment calmly considers the statement of your letter, nothing can be more plain than that, instead of an increase of the members naturally belonging to the Catholic Church in the United States there has actually been a serious loss. . . . I do not then mean to say that the number of Catholics is this day less than it was fifty years ago nor as small as it was five years since; but I do assert that the loss of members to the Catholic Church has been exceedingly great, when we take into account the Catholic

<sup>1</sup> Rome.

population at the time of the American Revolution, the acquisition of territory previously occupied by Catholics, the arrivals of Catholic immigrants and the conversions to the Catholic religion.

I submit the following (4) rough estimate as calculated to give a notion of this loss:

Fifty years ago (5) the population of the United States was three millions; today it is fifteen millions. I shall suppose (6) the natural (7) increase of the original three to give us seven millions of our present number; (8) this will leave us eight millions of immigrants and their descendants, together with those obtained by the acquisition of Louisiana and Florida.

Of the population acquired by immigration and by cession, (9) we may estimate at least one-half to have been Catholics; supposing the children to have adhered to the faith of their parents, if there were no loss we should have at least four millions of Catholics from this source, without regarding the portion which was Catholic fifty years ago, and its natural increase and the many converts and their descendants. Yet there are many who this day are well informed upon the subject of our churches, (10) who doubt if we have one million of Catholics. Four years since (11) my estimate was little more than one half million. Upon my first arrival in the United States in 1820 (12) I saw in a public document, coming from a respectable source, the estimate to be 100,000, and this favorable and from a gentleman by no means unfriendly. I have since then made more close inquiries, taken more special notice of details, and received better information, and I think (13) the estimate may be safely fixed at 1,200,000.

. . . If I say, upon the foregoing data, that (14) we ought if there were no loss, to have 5,000,000 of Catholics, and that we have less than one million and a quarter, there must have been a loss of three million and three quarters<sup>2</sup> at least, and (15) the persons so lost are found amongst the various sects to the amount of thrice the number of the Catholic population of the whole country.

I estimate (16) the Catholics of my diocese at less than 12,000, and the descendants of Catholics in the various sects at about 38,000 or 40,000. The coincidence of the results creates a strong probability, it is indeed presumptive evidence, of the correctness of each estimate. And we may unhesi-

<sup>2</sup> O'Gorman, *op. cit.*, p. 490, and Canevin, *op. cit.*, p. 6, are in error in quoting this as "three millions and a quarter."

tatingly assert that the Catholic Church has, within the last fifty years, lost millions of members in the United States.<sup>3</sup>

The preceding lengthy excerpt from Bishop England's works, containing the charge that in his day millions had been lost to the Church in the United States, is presented to make it possible more easily to test the truth of his assertion, the circumstances under which it was issued, the reasons why he made it, the basis for it.

In the first place, this statement is made in a communication addressed to the Lyons headquarters of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith at a time when the society was in doubt whether or not to continue sending aid to the Church in the United States.<sup>4</sup> Bishop England's fear that he might lose the very necessary aid which the society had been extending him colored his views with a deep tinge of pessimism, and led him into exaggeration, unconscious without doubt, but no less truly exaggeration, of the evils which confronted him. In fact the entire course of his episcopate naturally led him to take such views. He, the first bishop of Charleston, had come to that diocese in 1820 from his native Ireland where the faith flourished despite all obstacles. He found in his new home a sad condition of intriguing trustees and malcontent priests, and the initial impression which he must have formed of his new home seems never to have left him. This led him, too, into the unwarrantable blunder, granting that conditions in Charleston were bad, of believing that therefore they were just as bad all over the country.

With this insight into the situation in which he was placed one can understand better the full tenor of his remarks. He was pleading for continuation of the aid previously extended to his diocese; he was not making a study of the growth or lack of growth of Catholicity in the United States, even though his communication ostensibly took the form of a sketch of the American Church.

Without considering further his motives or the circumstances of his diocese, we may proceed to an analysis of Bishop England's

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Works of Bishop England*, J. Murphy, 1849, vol. 3, pp. 226 seq.; cf. also for main statement, Murray, *op. cit.*, p. 581.

<sup>4</sup> "My object in sending it [the communication] to you, is in the hope that it may more deeply interest your society in our behalf." *Op. cit.*, vol. 3, p. 226. "I consider its [the society's] existence to be one of the greatest benefits conferred upon religion in the United States, and its continued exertions at this moment to be not only highly useful, but indispensably necessary. . . . Should we then be abandoned at such a moment, our power to resist them [enemies of the Faith] would be greatly diminished, and it would be questionable whether your former generosity would not prove in its results more injurious to religion than it has been beneficial."—*Ib.*, p. 245.

statement. The first point which such analysis brings to light is that he was not writing with any dependence on actual data; that he was citing his impression and belief only. Precise details (1),<sup>5</sup> in other words, statistics, are necessary for a discussion of the subject according to Bishop England himself. Such statistics, he says, are not available at Rome, where he was when he wrote the communication. He goes further, however, and gives it as his belief that no such statistics are extant. He is under the impression (2) that Europeans and even some Americans unwarrantably believe the Church in the United States to be flourishing; he thinks, that is to say, that there is here no true progress, but rather an actual loss. He has no doubt (3) the loss to Catholicity in the previous fifty years reaches into the millions. He sums up his general attitude in the statement: "I fear that this loss is not only real, but exceedingly great."<sup>6</sup> He proceeds then to give a "rough estimate" (4) of the alleged loss.

Bishop England convicts himself here on two counts. He is guilty of very unscientific procedure in venturing, without statistics, upon a discussion which, as he himself states, requires precise details. He fostered a very serious charge against the American Church (although perhaps it did not appear to him in that light), without having first verified it. There is no question whatsoever but that subjectively he was exculpated;<sup>7</sup> objectively, however, he committed a most unfortunate blunder, the effects of which are apparent in practically all chronicles and histories of the American Church.

On a second count, in stating that he could nowhere procure "exact returns" such as desired,<sup>8</sup> he was in error, so far as this statement refers to statistics on the population of the United States for various decadal years, and on immigration into this country. These statistics were available, but Bishop England neglected to obtain them before making his "computation."

He proceeds then to his estimate. He estimates (5) that the population of the United States was 3,000,000 in 1786.<sup>9</sup> In 1790, at the first census, the total population of the country was 3,929,214, including 757,208 colored.<sup>10</sup> The increase during the preceding decade must have been comparatively small under the

<sup>5</sup> Numbers in parentheses refer to the corresponding numbers in the excerpt quoted, to facilitate reference to it.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 245.

<sup>7</sup> "I consider it my duty to write as I think, and should I make any erroneous statement, to give the opportunity for its correction; and if my views be erroneous, I beg of my friends to set me right." *Op. cit.*, p. 226.

<sup>8</sup> "The question was put to me whether the Catholic Church really gained by the emigration to the United States, from the Catholic countries in Europe." *Op. cit.*, p. 225.

<sup>9</sup> Writing in 1836, he says, "fifty years ago."

<sup>10</sup> *A. T. C.*, p. 78.

circumstances of war and readjustment. Estimating it at possibly 800,000 the population in 1786 would have been about 3,500,000. "Today [1836]," the author goes on to say, "it is fifteen millions." It was practically 13,000,000 in 1830 and 17,000,000 in 1840. This estimate, therefore, may stand.

Here (6) his unscientific attitude asserts itself once more. The phrase "I shall suppose" introduces the next sentence. He supposes the natural increase (7) of the original three to give us seven millions of the 1836 population. This is a fatal error, to which is due the equally, if not more, erroneous conclusion at which he arrives. The rate of natural increase during this period averaged about  $33 \frac{1}{3}$  per cent per decade,<sup>11</sup> exclusive naturally of immigration. The compound result of this high rate, was that the "original three" (3,500,000 of 1786; 3,929,000 of 1790) amounted to 14,217,000 in 1836, instead of seven million as Bishop England would have it. The increase was some two hundred and seventy-five per cent instead of one hundred and thirty-three per cent. The accuracy of this present computation is clear both from the census figures on increase and immigration (the latter being negligible in the years in question) and from a consideration of the increase among the colored during the same period. The Negro population of the United States was 757,208 in 1790 and 2,873,648 in 1840, an increase of nearly three hundred per cent being registered. Practically no immigration affected this growth, since the importation of slaves was forbidden in 1808, while it had been practically abolished long before that date.<sup>12</sup>

When, therefore, the Bishop of Charleston, estimated the natural increase to have brought the 1786 stock merely to 7,000,000 instead of 14,000,000 odd, he paved the way for an even more serious error—the assumption that there had been during the fifty years an immigration (8) which, with descendants, amounted to 8,000,000 in 1836.<sup>13</sup> In point of fact, the total immigration listed for the fifty years was only 640,633.<sup>14</sup> Applying to these immigrants as they became incorporated in the population, the same rate of natural increase as was noted for the original stock, it is apparent that the immigrational stock of 1836 could not have amounted to more than 750,000, and this without allowing any deduction at all for deaths among the current immigration or for departures. The 8,000,000 estimate is so utterly wide of the mark as to be actually ludicrous from a mathematical point of view, did not so much depend upon it.

The estimate (9) that one-half of the immigration was of

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Table LII.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *Compendium of the U. S. Census*, 1850, p. 83; and *C. P. G.*, p. 91.

<sup>13</sup> It is not necessary to compute the effect of the acquisition of Louisiana and Florida upon the population, since it was negligible. Cf. Chap. IV.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *S. R. I.*, p. 4; also Table I, this work.

Catholic stock is debatable. Between one-third and one-half would be a more accurate estimate,<sup>15</sup> but taking Bishop England's estimate as it stands, and applying it to 750,000, the total immigrational stock (since 1786) as of the year 1836, the resultant is that the greatest possible gain to Catholicity through this source in the fifty years would have been 375,000. If this number is the greatest possible gain, it is also the greatest possible loss. If the American Church had lost absolutely every Catholic immigrant that came to America during the fifty years—the supposition is in itself preposterous—the loss thus recorded would be *exactly one-tenth* that posited by Bishop England, (14) who estimated it at three million and three-quarters.

Bishop England's haziness of data in regard to the actual Catholic population of his time—data which he uses to draw his conclusions with—is on a par with his other estimates. Some, he says, (10) doubt if we have one million of Catholics (in 1836). His own estimate for the year 1832 was (11) 500,000. While he does not directly say so, he seems to accept an estimate (12) of 100,000 as the Catholic population of 1820. Finally, he tentatively (13) adopts 1,200,000 as his estimate of the 1836 Catholic membership.

This latter estimate posits a growth which could not possibly have occurred. In order that the 1836 Catholic membership should have actually attained that figure it would be necessary to assume that the 1790 membership was 206,000 (compare this with the 100,000 which Bishop England considered a favorable estimate for the year 1820), instead of 35,000; that there was a three hundred per cent natural increase up to 1836; and a gain of 375,000 (one-half of all immigrational stock) due to immigration. According to Table XX the Catholic population in 1836 could not have been more than 535,000. Bishop England's estimate for 1832 is not far wrong, but the 500,000 of that year according to this estimate could not possibly have grown to 1,200,000 in four years.

The final statements of the excerpt continue the curiously unscientific procedure of the article. That the persons lost to the Church, three-quarters of the immigration (as Bishop England conceived it), should be found amongst the various sects (15) to the amount of thrice the number of the Catholics of the whole country, would be very strange, to say the least, for Catholics, when they give up the Church, by no means are inclined to join a sect. Their descendants may, but certainly not the first generation to any great extent. The statement that they were found in such large numbers amongst the sects, is in itself completely unacceptable, apart from the fact that no proof at all is given, and

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Tables I, XVII, XVIII, XIX, and XX.

that none could be, from the very nature of the case. The disproof lies in a consideration of the data adduced here as to the actual membership, and the immigrational stock of that year. The previous errors lead naturally to the present errors; the latter is really a part of the former.

Waiving the point that Bishop England could not possibly have had any accurate statistics on the number of descendants of Catholics in the sects (16) in his diocese, he is in error in supposing that the same proportion of loss would apply all through the country. His "coincidence of results," his "presumptive evidence" are merely the results of his incorrect method of calculation. They are merely an instance of the logical error of a vicious circle. Granting, without conceding here, the fact that the descendants of Catholics among the sects outnumbered the Catholic population three to one in the diocese of Charleston, it must be remembered that conditions in the States of Georgia, and North and South Carolina, which comprised the diocese,<sup>16</sup> were quite different from those existing in other sections of the country. The entire foreign-born population of 1850 (fourteen years after Bishop England's computation) in these states amounted to only 17,525.<sup>17</sup> It was 0.7 per cent of the total population in Georgia, only 0.3 per cent in North Carolina, and 1.3 per cent in South Carolina.<sup>18</sup> On the other hand, to give but a few examples, it was 23.5 per cent in California; 9.5 in the District of Columbia; 13.1 in Illinois; 13.1 in Pennsylvania; 16.5 in Massachusetts; 21.2 in New York, and 16.2 in Rhode Island.<sup>19</sup> Immigrants simply did not make their way in large numbers to the South. It is quite illogical—apart from the entire absence of statistics on the point—to judge of Pennsylvania and New York, for example, by conditions in Georgia and the Carolinas. In the former the very force of numbers among the immigrants guaranteed the success of the Church; in the latter this guarantee was lacking. The Catholic population, practically speaking, had to stand alone; it could not gain, but neither could it lose, much by immigration. Bishop England was wrong in thinking that the loss of immigrants constituted the great problem in his diocese; it was not so much the loss as the lack of them that hampered the growth of the Church of Charleston.

We may sum up this discussion with the remark that Bishop England's allegation of a loss of 3,750,000 to Catholicity between 1786 and 1836 is based on a completely erroneous assumption of an immigration of 8,000,000 during the fifty years to which he has reference. His entire statement is a network of hazy and

<sup>16</sup> England, *op. cit.*, p. 246.

<sup>17</sup> *Compendium of Seventh Census*, p. 61.

<sup>18</sup> *S. R. I.*, p. 446. <sup>19</sup> *Ib.*

rash assumptions, capped by this egregious error. His allegation may be said to be completely discredited today<sup>20</sup> and yet so potent were his name and his reputation that (to mention only one instance) Murray,<sup>21</sup> in discussing Catholic losses, accepts it without question, prefacing his quotation with the remark that "Bishop England was the first who carefully (sic) and patiently investigated this subject."

A summary presentation of the main facts discussed in the preceding pages appears in the following table.

TABLE LII  
*Statistical Analysis of Bishop England's Estimates*

	Statistics	Bp. England
U. S. Population, 1786.....	3,500,000	3,000,000
Natural inc. 1786-1836, per cent...	275	133
Nat. inc. 1786-1836, numerical.....	10,718,000	4,000,000
Stock of 1786 in 1836.....	14,218,000	7,000,000
Immigration 1786-1836.....	640,633	"millions"
Imm. stock (1786-1836) in 1836...	750,000	8,000,000
U. S. Population, 1836.....	15,000,000 <sup>22</sup>	15,000,000
Catholics in imm. stock.....	375,000	4,000,000
Catholic loss, 1786-1836..... (none apparent) <sup>23</sup>		3,750,000

## II. THE LUCERNE MEMORIAL, 1891 AND 1910, AND ALLIED ASSERTIONS

The next allegation of Catholic loss to be considered is rather a group of allegations most of which were made in connection with the movement known as Cahenslyism, chiefly at the end of the eighties in the last century, though similar assertions were made before that date, and have been made since. It is important to note that these assertions were all made not in an *ex professo* study of Catholic growth but as arguments and special pleas for the particular views advocated.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Canevin and O'Gorman, *op. et loc. cit.*

<sup>21</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 581.

<sup>22</sup> The exact total is found to be 14,968,000. Decadal increases were 34 per cent, 35.4, 31.5, 32, 30.

<sup>23</sup> No loss is apparent. Undoubtedly some Catholics were lost, but, as pointed out in the preceding chapter, this loss could not have been appreciably greater than the ordinary loss constantly occurring everywhere. On this point more will be said in the following chapter.

The greatest possible loss if every Catholic immigrant left the Church would have been only 375,000. Bishop England considered 250,000 to have been retained. Hence the greatest loss would have been only 125,000 then.

<sup>24</sup> It would serve no good purpose to outline here what these views were. The racial and lingual questions involved gave rise to much acrimonious debate now happily ceased.

A. The Lucerne (Cahensly) Memorial of 1891 stated that there had been a loss of sixteen millions; in 1910 Mr. Cahensly in another memorial presented to the Pope calculated the loss at ten millions. The two following statements, representative of this view, are somewhat more detailed and furthermore are fairly in accord with each other.

B. The Church has made marvelous progress in this country. . . . Though not so flattering to our vanity it might prove more profitable to us to examine the losses we have sustained instead of rejoicing over the gains we have seemingly made. Gen. Von Steinwehr, an excellent statistician, gives the following estimates of the various nationalities for the year 1870:

Anglo-Saxons, 8,340,000; Irish, 10,255,000; Germans, 8,930,000; Italian and French, 1,016,000; Dutch and Scandinavians, 728,000; other nationalities, 4,236,000. Total population in 1870, 33,595,000.<sup>25</sup>

The present [1889] population of the United States is estimated to be 60,000,000.<sup>26</sup>

In the same proportion,<sup>27</sup> as given above for 1870, we would have at present (1889) about 20,000,000 Irish-born and 16,000,000 German-born population.<sup>28</sup>

Now there ought to be about 18,000,000<sup>29</sup> Irish Catholics, about one-third of the Germans, say nearly 5,000,000, Americans, Poles, Italians, etc., 2,000,000,<sup>30</sup>—total 25,000,000.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>25</sup> The category "other nationalities" is listed here as totaling 4,236,000. Government statistics state that Negroes alone numbered 4,880,009 in 1870. (*Negro Population*, p. 44.) The total population was 38,558,371 in that year. (A. T. C., p. 80.) The total *white* population in that year was 33,589,377. (*Ibid.*)

<sup>26</sup> The total population of the United States in 1890 was 62,947,714; the total white population was 55,101,258. (*Ibid.*)

<sup>27</sup> The same proportion would not hold in 1890 for Irish immigration was decreasing. Granting that the 1870 estimate of 10,255,000 of Irish nationality was correct (it was really only about 8,000,000—cf. Table LIII) this number would have increased to 12,606,000 in 1880 (20 per cent natural increase—Table XL—plus 300,000 net immigration—Table XXVII); this latter number could not have increased to more than 16,000,000 by 1890 (24 per cent natural increase—Table XXIX—plus 500,000 net immigration). Hence the 20,000,000 estimate is at least 4,000,000 too high.

<sup>28</sup> In the same way the German stock of 1870 could not have been as high as 8,000,000 (cf. Table LVI). But admitting the estimate of 8,930,000, it could not have increased to more than 14,500,000 by 1890. (Cf. tables quoted in preceding note.) The author of the pamphlet is, moreover, guilty of loose and inaccurate language when he takes "Irish-born," "German-born," to include Irish born, German born, and their descendants.

<sup>29</sup> There could not have been a total of 16,000,000 Irish stock yet the pamphlet posits 18,000,000 Irish Catholic stock. The proportion too (90 per cent Catholic) is quite incorrect, as will be pointed out in connection with statement C.

According to Hoffman's Directory the number of Catholics for the present year, 1889, is 8,157,676.<sup>32</sup>

This shows a loss of two-thirds of the Catholic population to the faith. . . . According to a census gathered by Father Enzleberger, we have 1,500,000 German Catholics, and our loss<sup>33</sup> from the above estimate is therefore 3,500,000.<sup>34</sup>

C. Abbé Villeneuve, in the Catholic congress at Liége in Sept., 1890, made the following statement, using practically the same argument as Gen. Von Steinwehr.

It has been calculated that (1) 18,000,000 of Irish, (2) sixteen millions of Germans, and (3) fifteen millions of French, Belgians, Italians, and Hungarians have emigrated to the United States. Out of eighteen millions from Ireland or children of Irish parents, (4) there are sixteen millions of Catholics. (5) Out of sixteen millions of Germans or children of Germans, there are three millions of Catholics. (6) Out of the emigrants from other nations there are five millions of Catholics. The statistics of the Propaganda give to the United States a Catholic population of (7) five millions and some hundreds of thousands, when it should be twenty-five millions. What, then, has become of the other twenty millions? They have turned Protestant or have become indifferent.<sup>35</sup>

The foregoing statements are in substantial agreement that there should have been about 25,000,000 Catholics in this country in 1890; that the difference between that figure and the actual number was sixteen, eighteen, or twenty millions; and that these millions had been lost to the Church. Not to complicate matters too much, let us here turn our attention to the third statement (C), which posits a loss of twenty millions. Before proceeding to an analysis of the statement one must first rule out of court the

<sup>32</sup> This statement will be discussed in the following pages.

<sup>33</sup> The reader will remember that the present study, after a painstaking investigation, decade by decade, and nationality by nationality, holds that the total Catholic population to be accounted for (not necessarily the *actual* population) in 1890 could not have been much over 9,000,000. (Cf. Table XL.) The above quotation is clearly a network of inaccuracies and groundless suppositions.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. preceding note; also Table XLVIII.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Table LVI.

<sup>36</sup> Rev. A. H. Walburg, *Question of Nationality*, Cincinnati, 1889, p. 48. This pamphlet appeared anonymously. Cf. also O'Gorman, *op. cit.*, p. 491.

<sup>37</sup> Quoted (in refutation) by Rev. Henry A. Brann, D.D., *Catholic World*, vol. LIV, 1892, p. 573.

1890 Catholic population estimate (7) of five millions, advanced by it. A reference to the twelfth chapter of the present work, and especially to the statement of the Catholic Directory for 1890 (cf. Table XLVIII) as to the Catholic population of that year, recalls to mind the fact that there were approximately 9,000,000 Catholics here at that time, the estimate reached in Table XXX being 8,909,000. Four millions of the alleged loss are here accounted for; it decreases to sixteen.

The further discussion of the statement resolves itself into an analysis of the immigrational-stock statistics which it presents, and a consideration of the Catholic percentage posited by it among the same. Before proceeding to the detailed analysis let us consider the general statement advanced (7) that in 1890 there were 25,000,000 of Catholic stock in the United States. Those who make such a statement forget that the total white population of the United States in 1890 was only fifty-five millions.<sup>36</sup> They assert, then, that the Catholics should in that year have numbered 45.5 per cent of the entire white population. Whence could have come this tremendous increase over the approximately 1.1 per cent registered in 1790? It could have come only from immigration. Yet the decadal tables point to the fact that the immigration into this country was hardly ever over fifty per cent Catholic, while it averaged only about 33 1/3 per cent Catholic at most. In order that there should have been in 1890 a Catholic stock of 25,000,000 it would have been necessary for the immigration to have been overwhelmingly if not entirely Catholic.<sup>37</sup> On the contrary, as a matter of fact, the immigration previous to 1890 was of a predominantly Protestant complexion. To hold, then, that nearly one-half of the white population of 1890 was of Catholic stock is completely unacceptable and at variance with statistics, which point out that the Protestant stock of 1890 consisted of about two-thirds of the immigrational stock plus over three million of the 1790 stock with its natural increase of a century.

A detailed study of the allegation under discussion amply corroborates this conclusion. The excerpt quoted holds that the Irish, German, French, Belgian, Italian, and Hungarian stocks of 1890 combined (cf. (1) et seq.) constituted a total of 49,000,000, thus leaving only 6,000,000 as the figure for all other white stocks. Without considering the Scandinavian and other stocks, let us examine the English stock alone. This stock in 1790 amounted to about 2,000,000 of the 3,000,000 whites enumerated in the

<sup>36</sup> By official statistics, 55,101,258. Cf. *A. T. C.*, p. 80.

<sup>37</sup> The entire immigration from 1790 to 1890 was only 15,672,657, of which 10,373,628 came after 1850. The entire *net* immigration was 11,065,000 of which 4,790,000 entered after 1870 (cf. decadal summary tables). The only Catholic country sending an appreciable immigration previous to 1880 was Ireland.

census of that year.<sup>38</sup> Supposing that the rate of natural increase for this stock was the same as the general rate for the country (Table XL) it would have increased to over 20,000,000 by 1890, without counting the English immigration, which amounted to 1,552,970 from 1820 to 1890.<sup>39</sup> Granting that the original stock did not increase at the same rate as other stocks, a satisfactory deduction would be to leave out of consideration the no inconsiderable immigration. Or if this is not a sufficient deduction let us take 20,000,000 as the total of the English, Scandinavians, Greeks, and others who sent a considerable number of immigrants to us during the period. All these combined certainly amounted to more than twenty million in 1890. The Irish and other stocks mentioned above could not possibly then have amounted to more than 35,000,000 instead of 49,000,000 in that year. As we shall see they did not even attain that figure.

Coming now to the detailed statements, we are told first that there were in 1890 (1) eighteen million Irish in this country. This is a palpable miscalculation. It was calculated in the present study<sup>40</sup> that the Irish stock numbered 550,000 in 1790. Taking this as a base, Table LIII presents a computation, decade by decade, of the growth of the Irish stock from 1790 to 1890. The rate of natural increase adopted is the general rate for the country, although, as pointed out previously, there is practical certainty that the increase rate of the Irish must be much below it.<sup>41</sup> The immigrational increment for each decade is incorporated in the stock, a deduction of only ten per cent being allowed for deaths among the current immigration and for returns. The conclusion to which this computation leads is that the Irish stock numbered only twelve and one-half millions<sup>42</sup> in 1890 instead of the eighteen million claimed by the Abbé Villeneuve.

The deduction noted here, of five and one-half millions, from the supposed eighteen millions of Abbé Villeneuve means also a great deduction in the possible loss which he posited. Of the eighteen million Irish which he listed (4) he claimed sixteen millions, or eighty-nine per cent, should be Catholics. Were we to admit this proportion as correct there should be among the twelve and one-half million a total of eleven and one-quarter million Catholics—four and three-quarter millions less than the Abbé claimed, and that much less of a loss, as a consequence. The truth, however, is that the proportion adopted—eighty-nine per cent—is

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Chapter II, which estimates the Irish stock at 550,000, the German and Dutch at 600,000 and the French at 25,000. Other stocks were negligible in 1790.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *S. R. I.*, p. 44; or decadal tables.

<sup>40</sup> Chapter II.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Tables XXXVII and XLI; cf. p. 129.

<sup>42</sup> The complete amount is 12,623,000.

TABLE LIII

*Growth of Irish Stock in United States, 1790 to 1890.<sup>43</sup>*

Decade ended	Immigration	Natural Increase Per Cent	Natural Increase numerical	Totals
1790 .....	.....	..	.....	550,000
1800 .....	.....	35.	202,000	750,000
1810 .....	.....	32.	240,000	990,000
1820 .....	63,000	31.	307,000	1,360,000
1830 .....	45,000	32.	436,000	1,840,000
1840 .....	187,000	30.	552,000	2,579,000
1850 .....	703,000	30.	774,000	4,056,000
1860 .....	823,000	30.	1,217,000	6,096,000
1870 .....	393,000	20.	1,219,000	7,708,000
1880 .....	394,000	24.	1,850,000	9,952,000
1890 .....	590,000	21.	2,081,000	12,623,000

far too high as the proportion of Catholics in Ireland to the total population ranged from eighty-two to seventy-five per cent during the century.<sup>44</sup>

The allegation under discussion here, however, makes a further error in that it does not take into account the true complexion of the Irish who immigrated to this country in the colonial days.<sup>45</sup> As we saw previously there were 550,000 of Irish stock in this country in 1790. Now this original stock, by natural increase alone, constituted in 1890 one-half of the total of that year and hence the religious complexion of one-half of the twelve and one-half million of that year must be computed, not according to the normal proportion of Catholics in Ireland, but according to the proportion as it actually was in this country in 1790. The fact is that of the 550,000 Irish stock of 1790 only 25,000 were Catholics, while 525,000 were non-Catholics.<sup>46</sup> The following table (LIV) indicates the growth of this stock according to its different

<sup>43</sup> Compiled from data taken from decadal tables. It may be noted that the method usually adopted in computing the stock of a given nationality in this country attempts to take into account the effect of intermarriage with persons of other nationalities, and then by fractions to determine the proportion that belongs to each nationality (cf. for example Faust, *The German Element in the United States*, vol. I, p. 78, etc.). Thus the children of parents, one of whom is Irish and the other German, will be half Irish and half German. Of two such families, each having four children, the total number of Irish would be six—two Irish parents and one-half of the eight children—the same as if the two Irish parents had married each other. The same total applies also to the German element. Hence, it is plain, the fractional system may be disregarded and the straight increase method applied, and this is the method adopted in the present table. However, to say that there were in 1890, 12,623,000 of Irish stock naturally does not imply that there were no intermarriages.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Table XII.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Chapter II.

<sup>46</sup> Chapter II, I, Irish Immigration Before 1790.

constituent (religious) elements, to 1890, without introducing the factor of immigration. The results are: 1st, the original Catholic stock had increased to the exceedingly small sum of 313,000; 2d, the non-Catholic stock numbered six and one-half millions; 3d, of these six and one-half millions, five millions represented the original Irish Protestant stock; and 4th, the original non-Catholic stock of Catholic descent (previous to 1790) had increased to about one million and one-half.

TABLE LIV

*Growth of original Irish Stock of 1790, natural Increase only, 1790-1890*

Decade ended	Per Cent	Cath. Stock	Non-Cath. Stock	Non-C. of C. descent	Straight non-Cath.
1790 .....	..	25,000	525,000	125,000	400,000
1800 .....	35.	33,750	708,750	168,750	540,000
1810 .....	32.	45,000	935,000	222,000	713,000
1820 .....	31.	60,000	1,224,000	291,000	933,000
1830 .....	32.	79,000	1,615,000	384,000	1,231,000
1840 .....	30.	103,000	2,099,500	499,000	1,600,500
1850 .....	30.	134,000	2,729,000	649,000	2,080,000
1860 .....	30.	174,000	3,548,000	844,000	2,704,000
1870 .....	20.	209,000	4,258,000	1,013,000	3,245,000
1880 .....	24.	259,000	5,280,000	1,256,000	4,024,000
1890 .....	21.	313,000	6,489,000	1,520,000	4,969,000

The result of this situation was that the Irish immigration of the century was not able to overcome the lead which the disproportionate number of non-Catholics, present in 1790, had given to that class of Irish. Consequently the Irish stock of 1890, instead of being, either actually or by right, nearly ninety per cent Catholic, was really only about thirty-six per cent Catholic. In other words, it is correct to posit in 1890, not sixteen million Irish Catholics, nor even eleven and one-quarter (of the twelve and one-half million actually present) but only somewhat over four and one-half million, had no loss occurred since 1790,<sup>47</sup> while about eight million were of non-Catholic stock. The enormous loss alleged by the Abbé Villeneuve thus gradually vanishes under the test of statistics. The data noted in the present paragraph are set forth statistically in Table LV.

In computing the German stock (2) Abbé Villeneuve was not so far wrong as in the case of the Irish. The number of German stock in 1890 was really slightly over thirteen, instead of sixteen, million. The number of Catholics among them was somewhat less than two million instead of the three million alleged (5), the great majority of the German stock of 1790 having been non-Catholic. Hence, one more million of possible loss is cut down.

<sup>47</sup> The loss previous to 1790 will be discussed in the following chapter.

TABLE LV

*Growth of Irish Stock, natural and immigrational, 1790-1890.*

	Non-Catholic <sup>48</sup>	Catholic	Total
1790	525,000	25,000	550,000
1800	712,000	38,000	750,000
1810	935,000	55,000	990,000
1820	1,248,000	112,000	1,360,000
1830	1,654,000	186,000	1,840,000
1840	2,191,000	388,000	2,579,000
1850	3,020,000	1,036,000	4,056,000
1860	4,133,000	1,963,000	6,096,000
1870	4,949,000	2,749,000	7,708,000
1880	6,325,000	3,827,000	9,952,000
1890	7,900,000	4,723,000	12,623,000

The following table presents a study of statistics on the German stock of 1890, with a separate column for the Catholic stock.

TABLE LVI

*Growth of German Stock, natural and immigrational, 1790-1890*

	Immi- gration	Natural Per Cent	Increase Numerical	Catholic Stock	Total
1790	.....	..	.....	8,000	600,000
1800	.....	35.	210,000	10,800	810,000
1810	.....	32.	291,600	14,688	1,101,600
1820	5,000 <sup>49</sup>	31.	341,496	20,000	1,448,096
1830	6,761	32.	463,630	37,921	1,916,456
1840	152,454	30.	574,920	70,592	2,611,000
1850	434,626	30.	783,300	209,122	3,794,000
1860	951,667	30.	1,138,200	516,000	5,832,000
1870	787,468	20.	1,166,400	826,000	7,678,000
1880	718,182	24.	1,865,940	1,205,000	10,074,000
1890	1,452,970	21.	2,115,540	1,862,000	13,289,000

The author of the statement under discussion makes his greatest blunders when he gives his estimates for other nationalities. He states (3) that fifteen millions of French, Belgians, Italians and Hungarians had emigrated to the United States by 1890. Even granting that he meant to speak of stocks (immigrants and descendants), and not merely of immigrants, his statement is so completely wide of the mark that it is difficult to understand how anyone could have given utterance to it. It is, and always has been, a very well known fact that France and Belgium never did send us many immigrants; and that the rush from Italy and

<sup>48</sup> The Irish non-Catholic *immigrational* gain during the century was 1,411,000; Irish Catholic *immigrational* gain was 4,410,000.

<sup>49</sup> No deduction is made in this table for current deaths or departures, so that the totals are consequently inclined to be an overestimate rather than an underestimate.

Austria-Hungary did not really commence until the very decade ending in 1890. The truth of the matter is that the total of all the immigration from these countries from 1820<sup>50</sup> to 1890 was only 1,233,000, without deducting for returns, departures, or deaths among the current immigration. Moreover, of these 1,233,000 the total in all the decades previous to 1880 was only 500,000 the consequence being that the stocks could not have increased to any great extent by that date. Even including the French-Canadians in our computation, the combined stocks of these nationalities could not have amounted to even three million by 1890. The surprising thing about the correlative statement on these nationalities (6) is that Abbé Villeneuve would claim only five million Catholic stock, or thirty three and one-third per cent, under this heading. Had he been logical he would have claimed nearer fourteen million and thus have raised the alleged loss very appreciably. Actually there were probably about two and one-half million Catholics of these stocks to be accounted for in 1890.

The following table presents statistics on these nationalities.

TABLE LVII

*Immigration Statistics for Austro-Hungarians, Belgians, French, and Italians, 1820 to 1890*

Decade ended	Austro-Hungarians <sup>51</sup>	Belgians	French	Italians
1830 .....	0	27	8,497	408
1840 .....	0	22	45,575	2,253
1850 .....	0	5,074	77,262	1,870
1860 .....	0	4,738	76,358	9,231
1870 .....	7,800	6,734	35,984	11,738
1880 .....	72,969	7,221	72,206	55,759
1890 .....	353,719	20,177	50,464	307,309
Total .....	434,488	43,993	366,344	388,558
Total immigration for all years to 1880 .....				501,714
Total for decade ended in 1890 .....				731,669
Grand total .....				1,233,383

Summing up the present discussion, it is conservative to hold that any statement which alleges by the year 1890 a Catholic loss of millions, of eighteen or twenty millions, of two-thirds the number that should have been Catholic at that date, does not deserve credence, for it cannot stand the test of statistics. Such a statement usually errs on one or more, if not all, of the following points. It fails to take into consideration the preponderantly

<sup>50</sup> There were very few of any of these stocks here previously to 1820.

<sup>51</sup> Austrians as well as Hungarians are included, although the statement quoted spoke only of Hungarians.

Protestant immigration of the colonial period; it overestimates foreign stocks; it posits an undue proportion of Catholics among the different stocks; it greatly overestimates the flow of immigration into the country; it fails to take into account the emigration from the country.

The following table presents in parallel columns a comparison of the statements made by Abbé Villeneuve with statistics. Not one of his statements can be considered as even approximately correct.

TABLE LVIII

*The Abbé Villeneuve's Statements compared with Statistics*

	Statistics	Abbé Villeneuve
Irish Stock, 1890.....	12,623,000	18,000,000
Catholic per cent in Irish stock.....	36	89
Irish Cath. to be accounted for, 1890	4,723,000	16,000,000
German stock, 1890.....	13,000,000	16,000,000
German Cath. to be acc. for, 1890.....	1,862,000	3,000,000
French, Belgian, etc., stocks, 1890...	3,000,000	15,000,000
French, etc., Catholics to be accounted for, 1890 .....	2,500,000	5,000,000
Catholic population, 1890.....	9,000,000	5,000,000
Catholic loss by 1890.....	(none apparent)	20,000,000

### III. MISCELLANEOUS ALLEGATIONS

From time to time there have appeared various statements, issued by numerous authors, to the effect that the Church has suffered an appalling loss in this country. These assertions are in most cases mere *obiter dicta*, and practically without exception are of a generalizing tendency, lacking in specific details and corroboratory proof. Such charges as are contained in these miscellaneous allegations are answered in the preceding pages of this chapter. However, because they are so frequently quoted, a brief treatment is here accorded the most prominent of these statements.

There occurs in the Life of Archbishop Spalding,<sup>52</sup> the assertion, "That, to confine ourselves to the period in which the hierarchy has been in existence here, we have lost in numbers by far more than we have gained, is, if I may express my opinion, beyond all doubt." The period to which this excerpt has reference is from 1789 to 1873, the year in which the Life was written. A footnote indicates dependence on Bishop England's original statement. The assertion may be dismissed, then, with the remark that it is not even a quasi calculation, as Bishop England's purported to be. It is merely an opinion, unfounded on fact, without

<sup>52</sup> By Rev. J. L. Spalding, p. 323. Quoted also in Murray, *op. cit.*, p. 583.

proof, and to be rejected as worthless, together with the latter, for the decadal tables prove that at least the great majority of our Catholic immigrants have been retained by the Church.

The claim that in 1870 we should have had twenty-four million Catholics of Celtic extraction,<sup>53</sup> is manifestly absurd when reference is made to the statistics adduced in Tables LV, and LVII. The entire white population of the United States in 1870, it must be remarked, was only thirty-three and one-half millions.<sup>54</sup> The accompanying claim that there had been a loss of 18,000,000 Catholics by 1874, falls with the failure of the other computation, which was, in fact, the forerunner of the statements discussed in connection with the Lucerne Memorial. The assertion made by the late Bishop McFaul of Trenton that by 1904 the Church had lost 30,000,000 members here<sup>55</sup> is merely a development of the preceding statements. There is no proof that such a loss took place; there is abundant proof that it did not; there is even absolute certainty that it could not have taken place, for natural increase and immigration never contributed so many of Catholic stock that that number could have been lost.

The Irish, for various reasons, have always been a prominent target for charges such as are under consideration here. Particular statements with regard to the Irish race are found upon examination to be no less unfounded than the more general assertions so far cited. There is a frequently quoted statement that "in 1850 there were 3,000,000 Irish-born in the United States."<sup>56</sup> This statement, made by William E. Robinson, a member of Congress, occurred in a speech at Hamilton College, Clinton, New York. Although Robinson is described as a "devoted Irishman"<sup>57</sup> he was evidently not averse to making political capital at the expense of

<sup>53</sup> Ford, in *Irish World*, July 25, 1874. By *Celtic* the article means Irish, Scotch, French, Spanish and Italian. This article is cited in Tardivel, *La situation religieuse aux Etats-Unis*, p. 257; in Battandier, *Annuaire Pontifical Catholique*, 1919, p. 605; in Murray, *op. cit.*, p. 611; and in O'Gorman, *op. cit.*, p. 491.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. *Negro Population*, p. 44. Ford makes the familiar error of underestimating some stocks and overestimating others in order to make his point. His computation supposes that all stocks other than the Celtic numbered only 14,500,000 in 1870. Now the colored stock alone numbered in that year 4,880,009 (*Negro Population*, *loc. cit.*). Thus Ford leaves only 9,620,000 for all other white stocks besides the Celtic. The German stock alone was close to 8,000,000 (Table LVI), the English between twelve and fifteen millions, in that year.

<sup>55</sup> Pastoral, 1904; cf. also Battandier, *op. et loc. cit.*

<sup>56</sup> The *New York Tribune*, July 30, 1851. Cf. Murray, *op. cit.*, p. 610. Cf. also *Truth*, April, 1912, p. 12 (Archbishop Canevin) for refutation, which errs, however, in regard to the number of Irish born in the United States in 1850. Thos. D'Arcy McGee, *History of the Irish Settlers in North America*, p. 187, places the Irish contingent at 4,000,000 at the close of the year 1850.

<sup>57</sup> Murray, *op. cit.*, p. 572.

his race. His mere *ipse dixit* has been handed from writer to writer down through the years that have since passed, as evidence that there must have been by 1850 a great loss to Catholicity among the Irish alone, since the total Catholic population of that year was only about one million and one-half. Very few writers have troubled themselves to ascertain, by a reference to easily available statistics, that there were in 1850 only 961,719 Irish born in the United States, while the total foreign born of all nationalities in that year was only 2,244,602.<sup>58</sup>

Another assertion which goes the rounds of authors and speakers is the charge that in 1850 there were in this country two million apostate Catholics, mainly Irish.<sup>59</sup> According to present computations (Table XXII) the total number of Catholics to be accounted for in 1850, supposing there had been no loss at all, was only 1,606,000. If every one of them had apostatized, if there had not been a single Catholic in the country in that year, the loss would have been only 1,606,000. Yet the assertion of one who was not acquainted with American conditions and American history, is accepted; his *obiter dictum* to the effect that we had nearly 2,000,000 apostate Irish among us in 1850 is taken as the trustworthy pronouncement of an authority who had studied the subject and could prove his statement. How rumors of this kind gain currency is a mystery.

Finally, the assertion is seriously advanced that the "Irish of the second generation generally give up the Church."<sup>60</sup> This statement is completely disproved by the accumulation of data adduced all through this work, and by the very obvious fact that, if it were true, there would be today only about one-half as many Catholics in the country as there actually are. But from the statistical and scientific point of view the statement is more reprehensible than if it were merely a plain error. It is in fact a harmful and most unfortunate generalization, for it is couched in such style that the author could not possibly prove his assertion, even as he could not possibly have any basis for it other than his personal observation of isolated cases, from which he unwarrantably proceeds to a most illogical conclusion, far wider than the premises.

There are almost innumerable other instances of allegations of losses to Catholicity but it would be tedious to treat them in detail. Probably the most sweeping is that made by one who concealed his identity behind the nom de plume of "A Catholic Mission-

<sup>58</sup> Cf. *S. R. I.*, p. 416.

<sup>59</sup> This statement was made by a Rev. Fr. Mullen, a delegate to this country from the Catholic University of Ireland in 1852. Cf. O'Gorman, *op. cit.*, p. 490; Battandier, *op. et loc. cit.* This is merely the preceding assertion dressed in different garb.

<sup>60</sup> de Nevers, *l'Ame Américaine*, vol. II, p. 87.

ary."<sup>61</sup> He claims, from a comparative study of percentage growths of the Catholic and Protestant stocks in Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, English-speaking Canada, and the United States, to have uncovered in those countries a loss of no less than sixty-three million Catholics between 1800 and 1900. His computation is as faulty as the cause which he assigns and is not worth while reproducing here. As for the cause, he thinks he indicts a language; he really indicts the Church itself, divine institution though it be. His special pleading is apparent here. "One chief cause of the apostasy of so many Catholics in my opinion is," he says, "the use of a Protestant and Protestantizing language. English is a Protestantizing language, and all the nations who adopt it—unless they be situated quite differently from ours—will, in the long run, turn Protestant. All we can do in the matter is to postpone the change. To prevent it is almost impossible, too many causes are at work."<sup>62</sup> This is not the place nor the time to defend the English or any other language. Suffice it to say that the author of such a statement is in reality impugning and attacking the divinity, the Christ-promised stability, of the Church. If his statement were true, the Church would long ago have perished from the earth; too many other natural obstacles, as strong or stronger, would have prevailed, if one reasons thus. Fortunately, the statement is not any more true than the allegation of an enormous loss, which it seeks to explain. Whatever one thinks of the advantage of this or that human institution, the promise of Christ Himself that no mere human obstacle can ever prevail against the Church stands for all time.

In concluding the present chapter one final remark is necessary. It is quite generally believed and accepted, it is frequently asserted, although without reference to statistics, that the majority of the immigrants to this country during the last one hundred years have come from Catholic countries. The inference from such a statement will always be that there has been a great loss to Catholicity

<sup>61</sup> Cf. *Fortnightly Review*, St. Louis, Nov. 15, 1912. It is stated, too, in *America*, vol. XI, May 2, 1914, in an editorial, that the Catholic population should be 30,000,000. Cf. in refutation, Thos. F. Coakley, "Is Peter's Bark Leaking?" *ib.*, May 16, 1914, p. 102; another charge is that the total Catholic population in 1923 should be 50,000,000, Eugene Weare, "Our Immigration Problem," in *America*, vol. XXIX, May 5, 1923, p. 55; cf. in refutation, Thos. F. Coakley, "Is Peter's Bark Leaking?" *ib.*, May 19, 1923, p. 108. Father Coakley himself is also alleged to have claimed that the Catholic population should have been 40,000,000 in 1911; cf. Adam J. Loeppert, *Modernism and the Vatican* (an anti-Catholic work), p. 298. Finally the familiar assertion that the Church as a whole loses by immigration to this country appeared again in 1923: cf. "Catholics and Immigration," the *Catholic World*, vol. CXVI, Jan., 1923, p. 549.

<sup>62</sup> *Ib.*, *Fortnightly Review*, vol. XX, 1913, p. 138. Quite different is the attitude of the *Congregation de Propaganda Fide*. Cf. "Nationalism and the Missions," *Catholic Mind*, vol. XVIII, 1920.

since Catholic statistics do not show such a growth. The truth is that of the total immigration from 1820 to 1920 only 43.3 per cent came from Catholic countries. Furthermore, it must be remembered that Ireland is the only Catholic country from which a large immigration into the United States has steadily flowed throughout the period. The influx from Austria-Hungary and from Italy—the new immigration—did not begin until after 1880.

The following table presents statistics on this point.

TABLE LIX

*Immigration to the United States by Country of Origin, by Religion, 1820 to 1920*

From non-Catholic countries	British No. America.....	1,973,292	
Bulgaria, Servia, Mont...	39,440	Not specified .....	253,838
Denmark .....	300,036	Total from non-Cath..	19,062,190
England .....	2,461,885		
Germany .....	5,495,691		
Greece .....	370,405		
Netherlands .....	219,661		
Norway .....	731,584		
Roumania .....	85,428	From Catholic Countries	
Russia .....	3,281,005	Austria-Hungary .....	4,068,803
Scotland .....	567,350	Belgium .....	137,542
Sweden .....	1,116,239	Central America .....	26,918
Switzerland .....	260,492	France .....	532,765
Turkey in Europe.....	162,898	Ireland .....	4,358,106
Wales .....	72,647	Italy .....	4,195,880
U. K. not specified.....	793,801	Mexico .....	296,649
Other Europe .....	20,895	Pacific Islands .....	22,286
China .....	347,338	Poland <sup>63</sup> .....	165,182
India .....	7,491	Portugal .....	222,721
Japan .....	242,181	So. America .....	71,284
Turkey in Asia.....	185,870	Spain .....	137,907
Other Asia .....	22,915	West Indies .....	356,570
Africa .....	18,024	Total from Cath.....	14,592,613
Australia & N. Z.....	31,654		
TOTAL FROM NON-CATHOLIC COUNTRIES...		19,062,190	
TOTAL FROM CATHOLIC COUNTRIES.....		14,592,613	

The discussion set forth in the present chapter may be summed up in the statement that the various allegations cited are not based on statistics. Hazy, vague, generalizing, or baseless and incorrect, they are not worthy of credence.<sup>64</sup> There is, however,

<sup>63</sup> For most of the century immigration from Poland is not segregated, nor is the complete Canadian or Mexican immigration listed, although accounted for in the decadal computations.

<sup>64</sup> The following works may be consulted in regard to the various claims of loss: Jules Tradivel, *La situation religieuse aux États-Unis, Illusions*

a certain grain of truth in the general statement that losses have occurred in this country. A development of, together with additions to, the treatment accorded this point in the second chapter will appear in the following pages.

*et réalité*, especially chap. xi, "Les pertes de l'église"; Edmond de Nevers, *L'Ame Américaine*; and Battandier, *Annuaire Pontifical catholique*, 1919.

Murray, *op. cit.*, has a chapter on the loss and gain of the Church. O'Gorman, *op. cit.*, chap. XXIX, has a somewhat more satisfactory treatment of the case, while he gives the results of John Gilmary Shea's investigation, which is one of the few scientific attempts to get at the facts. Finally Archbishop Canevin has probably the best treatment of the subject, in *Truth*, April, 1912; in the *Catholic Historical Review*, Jan., 1917; and in his 1923 pamphlet, *Catholic Growth in the United States*.

## CHAPTER XV

### CATHOLIC LEAKAGE

After a perusal of the two preceding chapters, the reader may be inclined to object that the present study tries to prove too much when it advances the proposition that no great loss has occurred to Catholicity in the United States in the last hundred years. "What," it may be asked, "of the numerous families, with Catholic names, enrolled among the sects? What of the numerous non-Catholic ministers, even, who bear distinctively Catholic names?" "What, too, of the many fallen-away Catholics, whom every pastor, nay, whom nearly every member of the faithful, knows of in perhaps every parish throughout the country?" It is true that there are many Protestants, and many un-churched persons, who bear distinctively Catholic names. It is true that there are, possibly even in every parish, Catholics who have left the Church within the memory of the present faithful. The author would be the last to deny these facts. The facts, however, do not run counter to anything that has been said in the course of this study.

A reference to the second chapter will recall to mind the fact that by 1790 there were in the United States about 125,000 Irish Catholics, 92,000 German Catholics, and some 23,000 French Catholics who, for various reasons, had been lost to the Church. According to Table LIV the 125,000 Irish (that is, persons of Irish birth or descent) who should have been Catholics in 1790 but were not, would have grown by natural increase to 1,520,000 by 1890. Extending the computation to 1920, the body would have included 2,349,000 persons in that year. Similarly the 92,000 Germans and the 23,000 French who should have been Catholics in 1790 would by 1920 through natural increase have amounted to 1,638,000 and 395,000 respectively. The total of these three bodies in 1920 was accordingly 4,382,000.

There is, then, good reason to hold that had such losses not occurred the 1920 Catholic population would have been greater, by some four millions, than it actually was. Not all of these four millions were descended from families bearing distinctively Catholic names; not all who were so descended retained the Catholic name through the century, in some cases the name having been purposely changed or modified, while in a vast number of instances the marriage of the female members of a family obliterated all

trace of evidence of the former Catholicity of their forbears. Yet it must be evident that in the year 1920 of these four millions there must have been some hundreds of thousands, possibly one million, bearing such distinctively Catholic names that one would naturally wonder why they were not Catholics; how they ever became Protestants.<sup>1</sup>

The evidence is so clear that such persons are, at least in large numbers, the descendants of those who were lost to the Church prior to 1790, that it must be obvious that the presence among the sects of so many families bearing Catholic names does not necessarily imply that there has been a continual heavy leakage from the Church. It would be rash and unwarranted to deny that any Catholics have joined the sects since 1790. The evidence all goes to show, however, that such as did were numerically negligible.

It may be urged, however, that by the above admission, as it might be styled, a loss of four million Catholics by the year 1920 is recorded in the United States. This cannot be conceded, for the loss did not occur in the United States at all but in the colonial possessions of England. The loss, moreover, occurred under the abnormal conditions described in an earlier chapter. Since the cause was abnormal the loss must be charged off as of the period when it occurred. Otherwise there would be no end to such calculations.

In judging the Church in the United States there is no more reason to go back to the seventeenth and eighteenth, colonial, centuries, than to go back to the sixteenth in judging the Church in Germany or England, or the Scandinavian countries. It would be absurd, in the light of all that has happened since the days of Luther and Henry VIII, to state that in Germany the Church numbers some twenty-one million souls, but that the other thirty-nine million inhabitants indicate a loss of that many to the Church; or that in England while the Church has some two million members, the other thirty-five million have been lost to her. Abnormal conditions existed at the time of the so-called Reformation. The loss has been by common agreement charged off to the sixteenth century. The abnormal conditions of colonial America, with the Cromwellian deportations and the general religious intolerance of the Government, present to us a parallel which cannot be denied. There are, it is true, possibly some three or four million persons in the United States who might be Catholics if their progenitors had not lost the faith in the colonial days. So are there also some sixty or seventy million other persons in this country who would today be Catholics if their progenitors had not lost the faith just one century previous to the beginning of the colonial period. Both

<sup>1</sup> Cf. O'Brien, *A Hidden Phase of American History*, p. 332 and *passim*, on the question of Irish names, changes in the same, etc.

facts are unfortunate but the latter more so than the former, and it is, too, just as cogent—that is to say, not pertinent to the subject at all. Conditions then, as they existed in the colonial period of America explain for the most part what would otherwise be a disturbing phenomenon in the American Church; a phenomenon, moreover, which has generally been misinterpreted as indicating a frequent, if not general, tendency on the part of Catholics here to apostatize.

There remains yet to be explained the other source of leakage referred to in the introductory paragraph of this chapter. Admitting the fact of the pre-1790 loss, it remains true that present-day Catholics can testify in large numbers to the fact of defection from the faith on the part of friends and relatives whom they know personally. This fact, it was stated, does not run counter to anything that has been said in the course of this study. The verification of this point is to be found in the connotation of conclusion No. 3:<sup>2</sup> "It is very probable that there has been no loss at all, beyond that defection of Catholics which ordinarily takes place among any population, due to the weakness of human nature and the usual manifestations of the same." If this conclusion be true, its truth will be found to rest ultimately on the further proposition that the causes of Catholic leakage in the United States are, in the main, the same as the causes of Catholic leakage elsewhere. In other words, if there cannot be found in this country, in addition to the ordinary causes of leakage, some special cause peculiar to the United States, or to conditions as they are found here, it must be admitted that the current losses that take place are merely the ordinary losses which are inevitably to be expected anywhere.

Among the causes usually advanced in explanation of Catholic leakage in the United States are mentioned mixed marriages, intemperance, poverty caused by intemperance, want of Catholic education, social and political persecution of Catholics, all of which produce in varying measure the proselytism of orphans and the defection of lukewarm or ignorant adults.<sup>3</sup> Now all these causes actually exist, but they are most assuredly not peculiar to the United States, either in themselves or in the force which they exert upon the Catholic population. Mixed marriages cause defection here; so do they in any predominantly non-Catholic country. So does their counterpart—the marriage of a Catholic to a lukewarm, indifferent or apostate Catholic<sup>4</sup> in Catholic countries. As for intemperance and its accompanying poverty, this may be better summed up under the more general and inclusive head of immor-

<sup>2</sup> Chap. XIII.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. O'Gorman, *op. cit.*, p. 499, upon whom Canevin, *op. cit.*, p. 18, depends.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Codex J. C., cc. 1065, 1066.

ality. A sinful life tends to draw the subject and even his family away from the Church. But again there is nothing to indicate a preponderating action of this cause on the Catholics of the United States.

So too with the lack of Catholic education. No country, Catholic or Protestant, can point to a more efficient Catholic school system than that which exists today in the United States. But, the answer will come, it is the neutral, godless, public school system which does the damage. Granted. It may be permitted to ask, however, if it does more damage than the neutral school system in France where the very name of Christ, the very idea of God, is deleted from the textbooks.<sup>5</sup> Again, it will be urged that the Catholic school system is a thing of recent years. This is hardly true. The development of the school system has been almost from the very beginning an integral part of the development of the Church here. In 1840 there were 454 Catholic churches in the United States.<sup>6</sup> There were in the same year at least two hundred Catholic parish schools in the country.<sup>7</sup> The maxim was, even at this early day, "The school alongside the Church," or, even, as with Bishop Hughes, "The school before the Church."<sup>8</sup> Conditions, certainly, could not be described as ideal, but they cannot be classed as, on the whole, any worse than conditions in revolutionary and post-revolutionary France, in the Austria of Josephism, in the England and Ireland of the penal days, in kulturkampf Germany, or in Mexico since the spoliation of 1857, or the worse injustice of 1917. The lack of Catholic education certainly must have caused some loss to the Church, but it must be classed as a universal cause, not a peculiarly American one.

As for the social and political persecution of Catholics the same is to be said. The student of history, especially of the early nineteenth century, cannot but admit that the position of the Catholic in this country was at least no worse than his position in the penal Protestant countries or the anti-clerical Catholic countries of Europe. Linked with this factor, as an integral part of it, was the evil of lay trusteeism. Although the latter may seem a separate factor, it really was an outgrowth of the former. It wrought much harm, but who can say it did as much as European anti-clericalism?

These factors have caused, and always will cause, a loss to Catholicity not only in the United States but universally. The only other cause to be alleged which could have brought about a

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Catholic Historical Review*, Jan., 1922, p. 545.

<sup>6</sup> Murray, *op. cit.*, p. 316.

<sup>7</sup> Burns, *Growth and Development of the Catholic School System in the United States*, p. 19.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.

defection from the Church is the lack of priests and churches to take care of an overwhelming immigration.<sup>9</sup> This point has really been discussed already in the decadal expositions of this study. There are, however, one or two angles to the question, a consideration of which will go far to explain why it may be held that any defection due to this source was negligible. Passing over the proof running through the decadal tables, which, by proving a general gain, disprove a general loss, the reason will be more apparent by inquiring more closely into the nature of the alleged cause and its actual application.

If one visualizes the present factor—"dearth of priests in the face of an overwhelming immigration"—as it is usually presented, he will find that its proponents apparently overlook two points, the distribution of Catholics and the distribution of immigrants in the country. When the picture is presented of thirty-five thousand Catholics and thirty-four priests in the United States in 1790, unless we are precise we are apt to overlook two facts: first, that the country was much smaller then than it is today; and second, that the Catholics really were not very much scattered but were chiefly gathered together in two or three localities.<sup>10</sup> Had they been evenly scattered, even throughout the comparatively small territory of that day, the number of priests would have been completely inadequate to care for them. As it was, it was a constant struggle but not a superhuman one. The continuance, through the early decades of the century, of this fact that Catholics showed a tendency to congregate in centers, was the salvation of the Church. It is one of the very reasons why this factor failed to cause any great defection from the Church. As the territory of the United States expanded, so too did the Catholic population and the number of priests. Catholics, and priests, and hierarchy ventured into the new section, but never in such numbers that the Catholic population can even today be said to be evenly distributed throughout the country.<sup>11</sup> As in the early days, so down through the decades, Catholicity still chiefly congregated around certain centers—no longer two or three only, but in general throughout the eastern and midwestern cities and states. To the southern states Catholicity has not even today spread to any general extent; in the West, while Catholicity has spread thither and is now growing rapidly, it is for the most part still in its infancy.

The reason for this is found in the second point mentioned above—the distribution of immigrants. Many completely overlook the fact that immigration does not, and never did, distribute itself evenly throughout the country. Overlooking this fact, com-

<sup>9</sup> O'Gorman, *op. et loc. cit.*

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Chapter III.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the following chapter.

mentors on Catholic growth have usually declared that the failure of the Church to show in the South the same phenomenal growth that she exhibits in the North, argues a constant loss or leakage through failure to hold the immigrants, who, they presume, make their way to the South and there, for want of church facilities, are lost to the faith. It was precisely on this point that Bishop England made his great mistake.

For an understanding of the points to be brought out in this connection, it is important to consider the composition of the Catholic population of the United States. Table LX presents the fact that, roughly speaking, the original 1820 Catholic stock constitutes today only about eight per cent, the convert stock about seven per cent, and the immigrant stock about eighty-five per cent of the total Catholic population. As pointed out previously, immigration has made the Catholic Church of the United States. To a great extent in the early days it brought its own priests who settled among the immigrants and retained them in the Church. The fact that the Church shows no phenomenal growth in the South is precisely because immigrants did not settle there. It is a grave mistake, as we shall see, to assert that the lack of growth there connotes a loss of Catholic immigrants to the faith, owing to the lack of priests. Surely it caused the loss of some, but the real sequence of cause and effect here is that the lack of immigrants caused itself the lack of priests, and the lack of any great Catholic growth.

TABLE LX

*Original, convert and immigrational Catholic Stock, at end of Decades, 1820-1920*

Yr.	Nat. inc.	Original	Convert	Immigrational	Total
1820.....	...	195,000	.....	.....	195,000
1830.....	32.	257,400	6,000	54,600	318,000
1840.....	30.	334,600	17,400	311,000	663,000
1850.....	30.	435,000	40,600	1,130,400	1,606,000
1860.....	30.	565,500	82,800	2,454,700	3,103,000
1870.....	20.	678,600	139,300	3,686,100	4,504,000
1880.....	24.	841,400	242,700	5,174,900	6,259,000
1890.....	21.	1,018,100	379,700	7,511,200	8,909,000
1900.....	20.	1,221,700	580,600	10,238,700	12,041,000
1910.....	15.	1,404,900	867,600	14,090,500	16,363,000
1920.....	12.	1,573,500	1,271,500	16,983,000	19,828,000

As pointed out so many times in the course of this work Catholic immigrants must have been in vast majority retained by the Church, for otherwise no such growth as has been hers could have been recorded. It can confidently be asserted that this study has proved that the great majority of the immigrants have con-

stituted the pillar and the groundwork of the American Church. Let us proceed to the corollary: that in those sections of the country which do not exhibit a striking gain, there could not have been any great loss to the Church through the defection of immigrants.

Since 1850,<sup>12</sup> when statistics on this point begin, immigration has, to a very remarkable degree, flocked to the northern states—specifically to those in the geographical divisions known as the North Atlantic and the North Central.<sup>13</sup> Of the total foreign-born population of the United States these two divisions contained 88.1 per cent in 1850; 86.2 in 1860; 87.2 in 1870; 85.8 in 1880; 85.9 in 1890; and 86.3 in 1900.<sup>14</sup> At the same time, the South Atlantic and South Central divisions, combined, averaged only 7.6 per cent of the total foreign-born population.<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, there is an even more striking and pertinent point in the fact that immigration flocks not only to these main divisions but even to certain specific sections of the same; namely, to the large cities. Forty-nine and six-tenths per cent or practically one-half of the total foreign-born population of 1900 was situated in cities of 25,000 inhabitants or over, while 66.3 per cent were living in cities of over 2,500 population. To gauge the force of these statements it is sufficient to point out that only 22.2 per cent of the native-born were situated in cities of over 25,000 population and only 36.1 per cent in cities of 2,500 or over.<sup>16</sup>

TABLE LXI<sup>17</sup>

*Per cent Distribution of native and foreign-born Population of United States, by Class of Place of Residence, 1900*

Class of place of residence	Native-born	Foreign-born
Total .....	100.0	100.0
Cities of 2,500 or over.....	36.1	66.3
100,000 or over.....	15.5	38.8
25,000 to 100,000.....	6.7	10.8
8,000 to 25,000.....	6.6	9.2
4,000 to 8,000.....	4.4	4.6
2,500 to 4,000.....	2.9	2.9
Smaller cities and country districts.....	63.9	33.7

<sup>12</sup> The same is true previous to 1850, but there are no statistics.

<sup>13</sup> North Atlantic includes the New England States and New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. North Central includes Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska and Kansas.

<sup>14</sup> *S. R. I.*, Part II: Distribution of Immigrants, p. 412.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 420 and 421.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

The argument is clear: the Church of those sections of the country, and especially the cities, which habitually received the majority of our immigrants, was successful, even though it did not find it an easy task, in retaining the immigrants which flocked thither; the Church in the South, even though it had lost all of the few Catholic immigrants that made their way thither would not, even then, have lost very many. Let us examine more specifically the conditions in the three states which made up Bishop England's diocese of Charleston—North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia—states for which we have Bishop England's Catholic statistics for 1836. It will be apparent from this examination that whatever loss took place must have been so small that it cannot be measured.

According to Bishop England, the Catholic population of these three states was "less than 12,000" in 1836. His estimates on other points were incorrect, but it may be presumed, in view of the nature of his remarks, that he did not overestimate here. One may then accept 11,500 as his estimate of the number of Catholics in the three states in 1836. The estimate of the Catholic Directory on the 1920 Catholic population of the same states (then constituting the dioceses of Charleston and Savannah, and the vicariate of North Carolina) was about 39,000. The point that this is probably an underestimate may be waived. On these figures the Catholic population of the states in question had multiplied three and one-half times since 1836. This is not much when compared with the growth throughout the country. It is, however, almost exactly the rate at which the total population of the three states increased. In 1840 the latter was 2,039,209 and in 1920 it was 7,138,679.<sup>18</sup> While the total population of the country was increasing over sixfold<sup>19</sup> that of these three states was increasing at only about one-half that rate. The reason is, of course, the lack of immigration in the South. Natural increase was practically the only source of increase, while, at the same time, migration to other states kept this down to a minimum. The Church increased at the same rate as the general population in these states; the increase was practically unaffected by immigration. The conclusion must be accepted that no great loss to Catholicity could have occurred in these states.

To bring out this conclusion more concretely the following table presents statistics on the number of foreign born in the southern states from 1850 to 1920 together with the per cent each figure is of the total population of each state. It will be apparent that the same general conclusion found true in regard to the three states already discussed must apply also to the other states

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *A. F. C.*, p. 18.

<sup>19</sup> From 17,000,000 in 1840, to 105,000,000 in 1920.

of the South, although for the latter no detailed analysis will be made, since no statistics can be adduced on their mid-century Catholic population.

Continuing the discussion of the three states composing Bishop England's diocese, the present table shows that the foreign-born population of South Carolina was actually less in 1920 than it was in 1850, while for the three states combined the increase was less than 12,000.<sup>20</sup> In per cent, for all the decades the foreign-born population hardly ever reached as high as one per cent of the total population, while in the majority of cases it ran as low as two-, three-, or four-tenths of one per cent. The percentage of Catholics among these foreigners in the southern states was usually low, because the Catholic races did not make their way south even proportionately to the small number of foreigners that did. However, if one-third to one-half were Catholic, it needs no deep calculation to see that even if all were lost to the faith (and that is by no means true) the loss would have been a very small one.

TABLE LXII

*Number and per cent<sup>21</sup> of Foreign Born in the Population of southern States, 1850 to 1920*

	1920		1910		1900		1890	
	Num.	Per cent						
N. Carolina .....	7,272	.3	6,092	.3	4,492	.2	3,702	.2
S. Carolina .....	6,582	.4	6,179	.4	5,528	.4	6,270	.5
Georgia .....	16,564	.6	15,477	.6	12,403	.6	12,137	.7
Virginia .....	31,705	1.3	27,957	1.3	19,461	1.0	18,374	1.1
W. Virginia .....	62,105	4.2	57,218	4.6	22,451	2.3	18,883	2.5
Florida .....	53,864	5.5	40,633	5.4	23,832	4.5	22,932	5.9
Kentucky .....	30,906	1.2	40,162	1.8	50,249	2.3	59,356	3.2
Tennessee .....	15,648	.6	18,607	.9	17,746	.9	20,029	1.1
Alabama .....	18,027	.7	19,286	.9	14,592	.8	14,777	1.0
Mississippi .....	8,408	.5	9,770	.5	7,981	.5	7,952	.6
	1880		1870		1860		1850	
N. Carolina .....	3,742	.3	3,029	.3	3,298	.3	2,581	.3
S. Carolina .....	7,686	.8	8,074	1.1	9,986	1.4	8,707	1.3
Georgia .....	10,564	.7	11,127	.9	11,671	1.1	6,488	.7
Virginia .....	14,696	1.0	13,754	1.1	35,058	2.2	22,985	1.6
W. Virginia .....	18,265	3.0	17,091	3.9	.....	..	.....	..
Florida .....	9,909	3.7	4,967	2.6	3,309	2.4	2,769	3.2
Kentucky .....	59,517	3.6	63,398	4.8	59,799	5.2	31,420	3.2
Tennessee .....	16,702	1.1	19,316	1.5	21,226	1.9	5,653	.6
Alabama .....	9,734	.8	9,962	1.0	12,352	1.3	7,509	1.0
Mississippi .....	9,209	.8	11,191	1.4	8,558	1.1	4,788	.8

<sup>20</sup> Of the nine states (West Virginia is excluded because no reference to 1850 can be made), only one—Florida—had a greater proportion of foreign born in 1920 than in 1850; six had the same percentage in both years; two—South Carolina and Kentucky—had fewer foreign born, both proportionately and numerically, in 1920 than in 1850.

<sup>21</sup> Per cent of the total population of the states. Compiled from *S. R. I.*, p. 444, and *A. F. C.*, p. 274.

For an understanding of the full force of the preceding table it is sufficient to remark that already as early as 1850, 9.7 per cent of the total population of the country was foreign born. In that year New England was 11.2, and New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania averaged 17.3 per cent foreign born. In 1900 the total population of the country was 13.6 per cent foreign born, New England was 25.8 per cent; New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, 21.5 per cent. To take at random a few individual states in 1900, Massachusetts was 30.2; Rhode Island, 31.4; Connecticut, 26.2, and New York, 26.1 per cent.<sup>22</sup> When compared with these, the three-tenths of one per cent in North Carolina is quite negligible.

The factor of dearth of priests, as a cause of defection, could apply only where priests were really scarce, and this was chiefly in the South. Hence the present detailed treatment of the subject. As for the general application of the factor, it is apparent from a glance at Table LXIII that the proportion of priests to people has been practically constant throughout the century. There is today in many places a scarcity of priests; there probably will be for many years to come. In general, however, it cannot be successfully contended that this is a factor calculated to cause directly any appreciable loss.<sup>23</sup>

The argument presented in this chapter strengthens the conclusion that no great loss to Catholicity has occurred in the United States. The forces of evil are rampant here as they are, and always will be, elsewhere. They take their toll in apostasy and defection, and this is, in the main, the true explanation of the presence in our parishes of fallen-away Catholics; it is a condition, as pointed out above, not peculiar to any one country or any particular period. Whether the loss due to this be greater or less than occurred in the original body of the Apostles, a loss which, to put it statistically, was 8.33 per cent, there is no evidence to indicate that it is or ever has been abnormal. There is no evidence to indicate it is greater here than in other countries.

It would be rash to try to measure this loss statistically. What the average number of fallen-away Catholics in each parish is it is absolutely impossible to say, but if the average were as high as ten for each parish, the total for the country would then be only about 200,000—not a very high figure. If the average were as high as fifty for every parish (it is difficult to believe that it is so high), the total would then be about one million, or about five per cent of the entire Catholic membership of the country. It must be

<sup>22</sup> *S. R. I., loc. cit.*

<sup>23</sup> Nor is it a peculiarly American factor. Witness the parish in Paris, France, which claims a membership of 150,000. Cf. *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, vol. XXV, Dec., 1924, art. "Catholicity in France."

256 HAS THE IMMIGRANT KEPT THE FAITH?

remembered, too, in this connection that many, very many, of these fallen-away Catholics return sooner or later to the Church. Finally, the vast influx of conversions more than makes up numerically for whatever loss occurs in this way.

## CHAPTER XVI

### CHURCH PROBLEMS IN AMERICA

Although it may be held that the causes of defection from the faith which operated in America did not constitute abnormal causes or produce an abnormal loss it nevertheless remains true that had it not been for the extraordinary efforts put forth by the Church in America—not to mention divine grace, the effect of which naturally cannot be measured—a great loss to the Church would have been quite possible. The path of the American Church, especially in the early days, was not a rose-strewn highway. Obstacles beset that path, and though they were, on the whole, successfully overcome, this study would not be complete without a reference to such as have not yet received sufficient treatment. These obstacles were chiefly two: the distribution of priests and people in a vast territory; and the reception and assimilation of a vast number of immigrants year by year, without cessation, for an entire century.

In the preceding chapter it was pointed out that the Catholic population of the United States, upon the foundation of the republic, was centered chiefly in two localities; and that the vast majority of our immigrants from whom has been drawn the greatest portion of our Catholic increase during the century, have shown a general and continued disposition to settle in large centers, and in certain states. That these facts were providential, in lessening the burden of the Church, is self-evident. It would be quite incorrect, however, to deduce either from the mere facts themselves or from what has been said in regard to them, the conclusion that the problem of a scattered population has not confronted the American Church.

Had Catholics always settled and always remained exclusively in sections where the Church was firmly established, naturally no such problem would have presented itself. It would have been undesirable that Catholics should not have penetrated, at least in some degree, to all sections of the country, for otherwise the sphere of influence of the Church would have been considerably circumscribed. It would, too, have been little short of the phenomenal, if not the miraculous, had not some Catholics made their way to the South and the West, for surely some Catholics must inevitably be found in any heterogeneous, cosmopolitan population such as that especially which opened up the new lands of the West.

The development of the hierarchy, as pictured in connection with the decadal tables, discloses the fact that Catholics have spread to every corner of the country, and the Church with them, so that today, with the exception of Nevada, which is assigned in part to the diocese of Sacramento and in part to that of Salt Lake City, there is not a state in the Union in which there is not situated at least one diocesan see. This very development of the hierarchy has been providential, for without the hierarchy there would have been fewer priests, schools, and churches, a consequent lessening of the bond between the Church and its scattered members, and an accompanying loss to the Church.

It is not intended in this connection to retrace once more the development of the American hierarchy, or to try to measure the extent of the problem throughout all the decades. It must be noted only that the spreading of the Church over the country was a gradual process even as the continental expansion of the country itself took place only by degrees. One must avoid the rather easily admitted fallacy of picturing this struggle of the Church as existing in its full extent throughout the present United States during the entire century under discussion. The full problem presented itself only gradually, as the expansion of the country progressed. Proportionately, nevertheless, the problem was always about the same.

The Church in the scattered districts had a struggle in supplying priests and churches to accommodate its scattered members. As time went on the "frontier districts" included more and more states and with difficulty the church organization was supplied them. Very probably throughout these scattered districts the proportion of priests to people remained approximately the same through the decades, the constant increase in the number of priests being utilized chiefly to man new sections of the expanding country. Numerically, however, from the point of view of church members, the problem became an ever more and more pressing one with the passage of the years. Whereas in 1790 this scattered Catholic population probably numbered a few thousand, in all probability not over five, with three or four priests attempting to cover the territory over which they were distributed, by 1820 there had been a considerable increase both in priests and people. With the advent of the railroad and the opening of the West, these scattered Catholics began to reach out beyond the Mississippi, so that by 1870 they had extended to the greater portion of the present United States. From 1870 to 1920 the situation attained its real development, although in some sections the expansion was such that from a scattered minority the Catholic membership came to be a respectable proportion of the total population.<sup>1</sup> Statistics for

<sup>1</sup> As in California, for instance.

the year 1920 will give some idea of the nature and extent of the problem.

The fact, indicated in the preceding chapter, that immigration has settled largely in the northern states and chiefly in those east of the Mississippi was interpreted as meaning, too, that the majority of the Catholic population of the country is to be found in those same states. For purposes of comparison and to avoid unwieldy terms, we may conventionally designate as the East that section in which the majority of the Catholics are concentrated. The rest of the country in which only a scattered Catholic population is found may then be designated as the West. The eastern division constitutes only a small portion of the United States, north of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi; excepting the dioceses of Marquette, Superior, and Duluth, but including southern Minnesota, Iowa and Missouri. The western division includes all the rest of the United States—the South as well as the real West.

The East then has an extent of 575,755 square miles; the West 2,451,034 square miles.<sup>2</sup> In the small eastern section—constituting about twenty per cent of the territory of the country—are found 14,363,000<sup>3</sup> or about eighty per cent of the Catholic population, while in the western section—about eighty per cent of the territory—are found only 3,523,000 or twenty per cent of our Catholics. On the other hand the total population of the two sections in 1920 was for the East 58,594,000 and for the West 47,089,000. In other words, the proportion of Catholics to total population in the former was twenty-four and one-half per cent, and in the latter only seven and one-half per cent.

The West, however, when one considers its Catholic population and not the territory, has more than its share of priests and churches, having 5,266, or twenty-five per cent of the former, and 6,443 or thirty-nine per cent of the latter.<sup>4</sup> In the East, then, there was one priest for every 877 Catholics; in the West, one priest for every 669 Catholics.

The real problem in the western section is not, however, the number of souls assigned to each priest. It is rather the expanse of territory over which they are scattered and over which, consequently, the priest has to travel in order to keep in touch with them. The territory of the eastern section averages one priest to every thirty-five square miles; the West, one to every 465 square miles. To give a few isolated instances: in the diocese of Salt

<sup>2</sup> Statistics cited in this present connection are, unless otherwise stated, quoted from "Extension Bulletin," a chronicle of the activities of Extension Society, issued in 1921. In some cases these statistics do not agree completely with figures cited elsewhere in the present work. The disagreement is slight, however, and does not affect the general argument.

<sup>3</sup> The Bulletin uses Catholic Directory figures for Catholic population.

<sup>4</sup> East—10,137 churches; West—6,443. East—16,377 priests; West—5,266.

Lake City each priest has assigned to him an average of 6,022 square miles; in Baker City, 2,519; in Cheyenne, 3,604; in Tucson, 2,146. In the East there is one church to every 56.8 square miles, in the West, one to every 380 square miles. It has even been computed that in the East the average Catholic is four and one-half miles from a church, while in the West he is thirty miles from one.<sup>5</sup>

So much for statistics. Something must be said by way of interpretation, for false conclusions can easily be drawn from them. The main fact to be noted is that the Church in the "western" section of the country is weak—much weaker than in the East—proportionately to the total population. There are too—although this condition is not confined exclusively to the West—many churches where Mass is said only once, twice, or three times a month; where a parochial school is simply impossible; where even the Sunday school catechetical instruction, at least under the direct supervision of the priest, is very difficult; where emergency sick calls, because of lack of means of communication and transportation, and because of excessive distances, cannot in many cases physically be made. One priest will at times have assigned to him as many as fifteen or twenty "stations," though such a number is unusual, where he visits irregularly his scattered flock. The bond of union between such scattered members and the Church is naturally at times very tenuous.

That these conditions apply to the entire Catholic population of the "western" section, however, is not true, and the danger of holding such a view constitutes the danger of misinterpreting the statistics which have been quoted above. It is true that there are in this section parishes which are equal in size to the whole of Denmark, dioceses larger than Italy.<sup>6</sup> It is true that in the diocese of Salt Lake City each priest has to superintend on an average some 6,000 square miles of territory. It must be remembered, however, that there are vast stretches of territory, particularly in the real West, which are really not inhabited at all—mountainous, desert, forest areas—but which are included in computing the "average" statistics. Moreover, there are sections, particularly in Utah, so predominantly settled by Mormons, where there is hardly even one Catholic. Again, even in this western section the population is not by any means found exclusively in outlying dis-

<sup>5</sup> There is really a fallacy here, however, for such a computation should take into account only the territory actually inhabited by Catholics.

<sup>6</sup> To enable comparison the following areas are given in thousands of square miles: France, 200; Great Britain and Ireland, 120; Italy, 110; Belgium, 29; Denmark, 15. Dioceses: Salt Lake, 156; Tucson, 133; Santa Fé, 104; Denver, 103; Cheyenne, 100; Dallas, 98; Great Falls, 94; Sacramento, 92. There are 38 other dioceses in the United States containing over 20,000 square miles.

tricts, the majority being in towns and cities. Hence, even in Utah the situation is not so bad as it seems at first sight.

The problem of taking care of the scattered Catholic population has been a perennial one; it is one which will occupy the attention of the hierarchy for many years to come. In the past, in the early days at least, the problem was more or less a general one. Today it is more special, being confined to fewer states and to a smaller number of dioceses. The crux of the problem is that the scattered flocks find it difficult to provide churches for their own accommodation, and to support a priest when one is available.

It was for the purpose of coping with this special problem that the Catholic Church Extension Society was founded in 1905,<sup>7</sup> and this society has done more than any one other single agency to retain in faith thousands of Catholics who, because of their scattered condition, and often, too, their poverty, were in danger of being lost to the Church. From its foundation to 1921, the Extension Society aided in building over 2,000 churches in localities which perhaps even today would not otherwise have been able to have a church. Through the use of chapel cars—railroad and auto—it has even brought to the remotest sections of the land, at least intermittently, the consolation of religion, the Sacraments and instruction, and in the same way has served to remove in many instances the pall of prejudice and bigotry from those hitherto ignorant of the nature of the Church and its institutions. It has acted as the clearing-house for the country in distributing to needy dioceses, parishes, and priests the offerings of the Catholics of the country, in churches, vestments, Mass stipends, and donations, its collections having risen from less than \$2,000 in 1905 to over \$575,000 in 1920.

While this problem in a new country like the United States will inevitably continue to present itself for many years, it may nevertheless be said that it is well in hand and that the situation, though acute and serious in a few localities, can hardly be said to be alarming, so long as the Catholics of the country continue to help their less fortunate brethren. A general idea of the situation since 1790 may be gained from Table LXIII.

While the coming of the immigrant to this country has made the American Church, this very influx of foreign peoples has constituted a serious problem in many ways. That the problem has in the main been successfully combated and overcome is a tribute to the faith of the immigrant, and to the wisdom of Rome in its selection of the leaders of the American Church. A consideration of the chief aspects of this problem leads to a truer appreciation of the obstacles which beset the American Church, to a more com-

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Msgr. (now Bishop) Francis C. Kelley, D.D., *The Story of Extension*, Chicago, 1922.

TABLE LXIII

*Proportion of Priests to People and Territory in the United States,  
1790 to 1920*

Year	Cath. Pop.	Priests	Priests to people; 1 to —.	Priests to sq. miles; 1 to —.
1790.....	35,000	34	1,000	12,270
1800.....	50,000	50	1,000	8,693
1810.....	95,000	70	1,350	7,929
1820.....	195,000	150	1,300	4,591
1830.....	318,000	232	1,370	3,781
1840.....	663,000	482	1,370	2,456
1850.....	1,606,000	1,800	880	848
1860.....	3,103,000	2,235	1,390	873
1870.....	4,504,000	3,780	1,200	575
1880.....	6,259,000	6,000	1,045	455
1890.....	8,909,000	9,168	970	325
1900.....	12,041,000	11,987	1,000	248
1910.....	16,363,000	16,550	990	170
1920.....	19,828,000	21,019	940	141

plete understanding of the resourcefulness, tact and continued effort which were required on the part of those who, under God, guided the fortunes of the Church in the new Republic.

A general view of the situation is very illuminating. The most important point to bear in mind is the fact that when the United States achieved independence the Catholic Church was practically non-existent here. The immigrants who made their way to this country came not to a land where there was an extensive hierarchy, a comprehensive church organization ready to function in assimilating the newcomers. They did not find churches awaiting them, provided with pastors and capable of accommodating the inrush. Church, pastor, even the hierarchy itself, all had to be provided practically by the immigrants themselves.

In the first decades, in fact all through the century, to a certain extent, it was not exactly a question of trying to tax, to enlarge, present accommodations in order to care for a larger number than originally they were intended for. It was rather simply a question of starting from the very foundation to provide that which did not exist before. As the decades passed and the hierarchy spread throughout the country the extent of this angle of the problem lessened somewhat, but even today it remains true that the Church must be constantly building new churches, opening up new territory, providing new accommodations for its new members.

It is this aspect which is perhaps most often misunderstood in Catholic countries where a new parish is a rather unusual event and a new church a novelty; where the very church edifices date back to the middle ages; where an inrush of foreign Catholics would at most mean only the changing and shifting and possibly

the expansion of an already existing organization. Only in a country like England can the problem be appreciated, and even there only approximately, for while English Catholics have had to build up a new organization, there has been there no such overwhelming rush of foreigners to compel almost a thousandfold expansion and upbuilding of inadequate resources.

A few concrete instances of conditions in the United States will illustrate better than words the point in question. In 1830 the Church here was called upon to care for nearly twice as many members as in 1820,<sup>8</sup> and in the very next decade the Catholic population more than doubled again. Then the 1840 Catholic membership practically tripled itself by 1850; while the latter nearly doubled itself in the following ten years. In the short space of forty years—from 1820 to 1860—the Catholic population of the United States multiplied itself sixteen times—from 195,000 to 3,103,000. The *proportionate* increase from 1860 could not continue so high, but it nevertheless continued strikingly large. What these phenomenal increases meant; for example, what the practical tripling of Catholic membership between 1840 and 1850 meant in the concrete, in the demands made upon the resources of the Church, for money to build churches and schools, for priests to minister to the people, can today only be pictured in the imagination. Its resources were taxed to the utmost.

It is certainly true to say that the Church of today could more easily be expected to arrange to accommodate fifty or sixty millions, and this would be a gigantic task, than could the Church of 1840 to accommodate the 1,606,000 of the following decade. How the mid-century Church ever succeeded in assimilating and caring for the enormous influx of new members cannot be depicted or measured statistically. Only in the supernatural grace of God can an adequate explanation be found.

Nor was this influx of immigrants merely a numerical addition to the American Church. "Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites"—indeed this was almost literally true—were there in the heterogeneous mass which stood knocking at the door of the Church. Had there been an increment of millions of English-speaking Catholics the problem would have been grave. But when we remember that the German, the Austrian, the Italian, the French, many of whom knew no English and learned none, had to be cared for, then the magnitude of the problem looms larger. The crisis was successfully passed, however, the difficulties were overcome, not indeed without some warring of tongues and clashing of races, but successfully, peacefully, and happily nevertheless.

It is necessary to touch here upon a supplementary point which has undoubtedly made more difficult the retention in the faith of

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Table XL.

some immigrants. Reference is to illiteracy. Certainly illiteracy does not have a direct relation to morality, but it remains true that an immigrant who does not understand the spoken word of the language of his adopted country and is at the same time unable to read the written word of his native language is at least in danger with respect to his faith.<sup>9</sup> This handicap has been present to a surprising degree, especially among our more recent immigrants. That it tends to decrease as the immigrant gradually learns English, and that it is obviated also to a great extent by our foreign-language churches is evident. That it must, however, constitute a serious problem is no less evident.

Some idea of the extent of the problem can be gleaned from the following table which presents statistics on illiteracy for certain European populations. It must be noted that these statistics refer to the populations in Europe and are drawn from national sources. In other words, illiteracy is not taken here as synonymous with lack of knowledge of English.

TABLE LXIV<sup>10</sup>

*Per cent of Illiteracy among the Populations of specified European Countries and of the United States*

Country	Per cent Illit.	Date	Basis	Source
Austria ..	23.8	1900	Persons 6 years & over.	Oesterr. <i>Statist. Handbuch</i> , 1907, p. 6.
Belgium ..	21.9	1900	Total population.	<i>Annuaire Statistique de la Belg.</i> , 1906, p. 74.
Hungary ..	41.0	1900	Total civil pop. 6 yrs. or over.	<i>Magyar Statistikai Evkony</i> , 1905, p. 324.
Italy ....	48.5	1905	Population 6 yrs. or over.	<i>Italia Annuario Statistico</i> , 1905-07, p. 245.
Portugal ..	75.1	1900	..... do .....	<i>Statesman's Year-Book</i> , 1908, p. 1367.
Russia ...	72.0	1897	Population 9 yrs. or over.	<i>Rossia-Perepis Naselenia</i> , 1897.
Serbia ....	83.0	1900	Total population.	<i>Statesman's Year-Book</i> , 1908, p. 1485.
Spain ....	63.8	1900	..... do .....	<i>Espana Censo de la Poblacion</i> , 1900, II, p. xl.
U. S. ....	10.7	1900	Population 10 yrs. or over.	<i>Twelfth Census, U. S.</i> , "Supplementary Analysis."

Thus far, the difficulties of the Church, or the danger for the Church, in connection with the coming of immigrants, has been discussed. There existed for the individual immigrant too a certain peril associated with his advent in a strange land. For all there was often grave danger of falling into the clutches of gangs of human vultures, in many cases of the same nationality as the prospective victim, with the probability of losing the savings of

<sup>9</sup> The problem is partially met by the presence of many foreign priests in the country.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *E. C. E.*, p. 33. Foreign statistics quoted above are practically the same as for our immigrants from these countries Cf. *S. R. I.*, pp. 84 and 85.

years, or being inveigled into evil ways ; there was often difficulty in finding work or in selecting a city or town wherein to settle ; for girls and women there was the danger, unfortunately only too real, of falling into the hands of procurers ; for all there was often, if not always, the need of good, disinterested advice on numerous matters.

While every parish priest in the United States, at least in those sections whither immigrants make their way, is, or should be, interested in the newcomer and in his welfare, it is apparent that the more specific and efficient channels of aid and protection for the immigrant are those societies which have sprung up with the express purpose of caring for the immigrant in both a religious and a material way. A brief reference to these may suffice here.<sup>11</sup> The first American organization for the care of immigrants was the Charitable Irish Society of Boston, Massachusetts, founded in March, 1737. Of an anti-Catholic character at first, its complexion soon changed, and it is today largely in the hands of Catholics. In 1790 the Hibernian Society for the Relief of Emigrants from Ireland was organized ; in 1812 a similar Hibernian Society was organized at Savannah ; and these were followed by the Emigrant Assistance Society in New York in 1825, and the Irish Emigrant Society in 1841 in the same city. In 1881 the Mission of Our Lady of the Rosary was founded in New York for the protection of Irish immigrant girls.

Prominent persons of other nationalities took up the work in the interest of their compatriots, and in 1868 the St. Raphael Society was founded in Germany for the protection of emigrants both at the port of departure and that of arrival, effective co-operation in the United States being given by the Central Verein. Later a branch of the St. Raphael Society was founded in New York, and in this connection the Leo House was established in 1889. In 1898 the Austrian Society of New York was founded ; in 1893 St. Joseph's Society was organized for the purpose of aiding persons of Polish nationality ; two years later the Jeanne d'Arc Home for the protection of French immigrant women was opened. The chief source of aid for Italians is the St. Raphael Society for Italian Immigrants, founded in 1891, while in 1901 a secular society was established for the same purpose. The Association for the Protection of Belgian and Dutch Immigrants was formed in 1907. Finally the National Catholic Welfare Conference has recently established a special department of immigration. All of these societies have received the co-operation of the Government in their care of the immigrant and have done much to protect the ignorant and the stranger from peril and

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Thos. F. Meehan, in *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. V, p. 402, art. "Emigrant Aid Societies."

danger.<sup>12</sup> In recent years, too, there has been shown a gratifying tendency to resort to such modern methods as welfare work, social organizations, the lay apostolate and even correspondence courses in Christian Doctrine, in the effort to keep in touch with the scattered or backward members of the flock.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> A summary of the legislation of the Holy See in regard to emigrants, both clerical and lay, is given in Micheletti, *Jus Pianum*, p. 440, seq. Cf. also *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, I, 692; IV, 526; 581; Cf. also *Le Canoniste*, 46th yr., Jan. 1924, p. 41, in regard to regulation of Holy See, of Jan. 26, 1923, requiring letter of identification for Italian emigrants.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. "The Cyrenians, a New Association for Immigration Welfare Work," the *Catholic Charities Review*, vol. VI, Oct., 1922, p. 277; "The Cyrenians," *ib.*, vol. VII, Feb., 1923, p. 60; J. P. Conry, "Social Organization of Italian Catholics," the *Catholic World*, vol. CXIV, Oct., 1921, p. 35; John E. Wickham, "A Missionary Band of Diocesan Priests," the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, vol. LXVI, Jan., 1922, p. 1; "The Lay Apostolate in Pittsburgh," *America*, vol. XXVII, Aug. 26, 1922, p. 455; "The Santa Maria Institute," *America*, vol. XXVI, Nov. 19, 1921, p. 118; E. J. O'Reilly, "The National Council of Catholic Men," *America*, vol. XXVI, Nov. 5, 1921, p. 59; Victor Day, "Correspondence Course in Christian Doctrine," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, vol. LXVII, Oct., 1922, p. 404; O'Hara, "The Lane County, Oregon, Experiment in the Catholic Rural Program," *N. C. W. C. Bulletin*, vol. II, Dec., 1920, p. 6.

## CHAPTER XVII

### CONCLUSION

The Catholic Church is truly catholic; she thrives under any environment, in any clime, among any race or nation; language, government, people, all are as one to that divinely appointed bark which Christ Himself launched upon the waters to sail the deep to the end of time, until at the final letting down of the nets they shall be drawn in laden with their draught of souls, ready to appear before the Judge on the last day. One might even justly doubt this note of the Church, one might even question her divinity if it were true that the atmosphere of America was fatal to the spiritual life of her children.

Under the more or less abnormal conditions of a new country, obstacles indeed beset her path, difficulties, both from within and from without the fold, thwarted at times her efforts, vicissitudes of accident and design occasionally retarded her growth. However, when we summarize the history of the Church in America we must accept as solidly proved and well established the fact that she has enjoyed a healthy natural increase, that a goodly number of converts have sought and obtained admission within her fold, and that a remarkably large Catholic immigration has been successfully assimilated and provided for even though at times the immigration of a decade was almost equal to the number of Catholics already in the country, while in one instance it actually exceeded it.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, the Church of the United States stands today a living exponent of the parable of the mustard seed: the weak anemic Church of 1790, apparently doomed to an uneventful dormancy of mere sufferance and toleration, the Church of 1820 for whose survival, even some members of its own hierarchy had grave fears, the Church of the mid-century which for very sustenance had often to call upon Europe for pecuniary aid and priestly volunteers—this mustard seed has developed into a great tree; in the twentieth century it has taken its rightful place in the very first rank among those churches which form the component parts of the Holy Catholic Church. The Church which but a century

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Table XXII. The Catholic population of the United States was 663,000 in 1840. In the following decade a net immigration of 700,000 Catholics is recorded.

ago was, as it were, the least of all the Churches, is now second only to Italy in the number of its residential sees,<sup>2</sup> while in membership also it is rightfully entitled to almost the same rank. With its four representatives in the Sacred College it takes a leading place in the councils of the Holy Father, who has thus so signally honored her. The Church which but a few decades ago was calling for charity, now is almost the fountainhead itself of charity in succoring its unfortunate and stricken brethren in Europe.

In truth, the chronicler of the growth of the Catholic Church in the United States must record a fact which history hitherto had never yet witnessed. The captivity of the Jews presents the spectacle of a whole people being transported bodily to a strange country and yet not only retaining but even purifying their religion because their prophets, priests, and Levites had gone with them into exile; because they remained a separate entity even in captivity. St. Peter, by his first sermon converted three thousand to the faith; St. Paul in his journeys won over whole cities to the new religion. Sts. Cyril and Methodius, St. Patrick, St. Augustine, St. Boniface, gained peoples and nations to the faith. Each of these facts is wonderful; each, in its own circumstances postulated a struggle to retain the converts thus made.

Not one, however, can parallel the phenomenon which occurred only in America. Not another instance in history is recorded, where millions of different races and nationalities, of varied natural prejudices and leanings, made their way to a strange country, not *en masse* but individually, there to build up what they found practically non-existent, a flourishing, closely knit, firmly welded Church in what was, and even today may be truthfully described as, otherwise a religious wilderness.

Only the miraculous work of a St. Peter, a St. Paul, or a St. Patrick, in ancient history is comparable to this phenomenon, and even this is comparable only in its wonderful character, and not in the particular circumstances. In modern history there is nothing even remotely to be compared with it. Ireland preserved the faith in the face of overwhelming odds; Germany after the onslaught of the Lutheran revolt had spent its force, preserved and built up a flourishing organization; in England when the hand of the religious oppressor had accomplished its ruinous purpose, little more than a remnant of the true Church remained; today little more than a remnant exists. But in each of these countries there was at least a foundation or the ruins thereof upon which to build. Only in America was it necessary to lay the foundation stone

<sup>2</sup> The Churches leading in the number of residential sees, rank as follows: Italy, 281; United States, 102 (now 103); France, 87; Spain, 56; Brazil, 54; Canada, 35; Mexico, 33; Ireland, 28. Cf. *Annuaire Pontifical Catholique*, 1924, p. 449.

itself; only in the United States was the Church built up of heterogeneous elements composed of all races and all peoples; only in this new republic occurred that phenomenal, almost miraculous, accretion of immigrational millions in the short space of but little more than a hundred years.

Here the children's pennies, the widow's mite, the laborer's contribution of money and time and brawn have dotted the land with cathedral and church and school, college and university, hospital and asylum and refuge. Here convent and monastery and rectory with their thousands of occupants vowed to the service of God proclaim the faith, the loyalty, the zeal of the American Catholic. Here under the ægis of democracy four Cardinal princes of the Church attest alike in their humble origin and their present dignity the democracy of Christ's holy Church and the honors which have been bestowed upon them in recognition of the merits of the youngest daughter of the Church. Here, under the banner of the Immaculate Conception, the Catholic Church stands the living exemplar of the counsels of Christ and the teachings of His Apostles.

"As the people, so the priest," to quote the converse of the usual proverb. Critics have ventured to censure the American priest on various counts. The only answer that need be vouchsafed is to point to the American Church itself. The people have contributed of their worldly goods and their time and labor to build up a vast network of ecclesiastical institutions, but the priest has exhorted them to that noble work, has directed them in it, has guided them to its completion. The people have retained the faith often under most difficult circumstances, but the frontier priest has ever been among them, is among them today, traveling hundreds of miles on foot, on horseback, or by vehicle, to carry to them instruction in the faith, the Sacraments, the consolations of religion. The people in the past have been accustomed to travel miles to attend Mass on Sunday, many even today undergo the same experience, but the pioneer priest makes his way to them by crude or refined method of transportation, often traveling to widely different points each Sunday, year after year, and decade after decade. The people have often contributed from the store which they needed for the very necessities of life, but the pioneer priest has often gone shelterless and hungry and ill-clothed that, like his Master before him, he might go out into the highways and the byways and seek for the sheep that had strayed from the fold. For the one who reads history aright there can be but one judgment passed on the quality of the American priest: his apostolic zeal, his Christlike spirit, his God-given tenacity of purpose, have made possible that modern miracle, the Catholic Church of the United States.

The Catholic Church of the United States: she needs no eulogy,

she needs no apology. Deeds are better than words ; facts are more cogent than fancies. The Catholic Church of the United States stands before the world a living, vital, irrefragable, concrete proof of the power and the grace of God. Glorious are the pages of her history ; entrancing the romance of her pioneer priests ; more thrilling, more entralling than fiction, the deeds that she has accomplished. May the chronicler of the next century of her growth be enabled to record an equally glorious era in her history.

## APPENDIX

### I. IMMIGRATION-RESTRICTION LAWS

The general policy of the United States since its foundation has been to admit any immigrant seeking residence in the country. Selection of immigrants by means of national laws denying entrance to the United States to persons of certain classes began in 1875. Laws of that year, of 1882, 1885, 1891, 1897, 1907, and 1917, were passed with the purpose of barring undesirable immigrants, under which class were included chiefly immoral persons, criminals, persons suffering from a loathsome or a dangerous contagious disease, lunatics, idiots, insane, and those likely to become a public charge.

No restriction, however, was placed on the number to be admitted in any period from any European country. There has nevertheless always been in American life among some circles a certain undercurrent of opposition and antipathy to the "foreigner" with an accompanying agitation to restrict the number, especially of the so-called "new" immigrants, admissible to the United States. The agitation became stronger after the World War and has resulted in restrictions being placed on immigration.

#### I. THE IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION LAW OF MAY 19, 1921

The first law passed was that of May 19, 1921. Defining "alien" as any person not native-born or naturalized, exclusive of Indians not taxed, and citizens of the islands under United States jurisdiction, it limited the number of aliens admissible, to three per cent of the number of the particular nationality in each case resident in the United States as shown by the United States Census of 1910.<sup>1</sup> Not more than twenty per cent of each national yearly quota was to be admitted in any one month. This law consequently limited to 357,803 the maximum annual number of immigrants admissible. It remained in force until June 30, 1924. Its national quotas were as follows:

<sup>1</sup> Exceptions were made for persons of certain professions, for Government employees, their families and servants, visitors for pleasure or business, others merely going through the country as a convenient route, one-year residents of Canada, Newfoundland, Cuba, Mexico, or Central or South American countries, and children (under eighteen) of United States citizens.

TABLE LXV  
*Yearly and monthly Quotas under Restriction Act of 1921*

Country or region	Max. mo. quota	Annual quota	Country or region	Max. mo. quota	Annual quota
Albania .....	58	288	Roumania .....	1,484	7,419
Armenia (Russ.) ..	46	230	Russia <sup>2</sup> .....	4,881	24,405
Austria .....	1,468	7,342	Estonia .....	270	1,348
Belgium .....	313	1,563	Latvia .....	308	1,540
Bulgaria .....	61	302	Lithuania .....	526	2,629
Czechoslovakia ...	2,871	14,357	Spain .....	182	912
Danzig .....	60	301	Sweden .....	4,008	20,042
Denmark .....	1,124	5,619	Switzerland .....	750	3,752
Egypt .....	4	18	United Kingdom..	15,468	77,342
Finland .....	784	3,921	Jugo-Slavia .....	1,285	6,426
Fiume .....	14	71	Other Europe.....	17	86
France .....	1,146	5,729	Palestine .....	12	57
Germany .....	13,521	67,607	Syria .....	177	882
Greece .....	613	3,063	Turkey .....	531	2,654
Hungary .....	1,149	5,747	Other Asia.....	19	92
Iceland .....	15	75	Africa .....	21	104
Italy .....	8,411	42,057	Atlantic Islands...	24	121
Luxemburg .....	19	92	Australia .....	56	279
Netherlands .....	721	3,607	New Zealand.....	16	80
Norway .....	2,440	12,202	Total <sup>3</sup> .....	71,561	357,803
Poland .....	6,195	30,977			
Portugal .....	493	2,465			

## 2. THE RESTRICTION LAW OF MAY 26, 1924

The immigration law of 1924, effective July 1, provided for a reduction, by more than fifty per cent, of the number of aliens permitted to enter the United States during the three years following that date. The total quota is reduced from 357,803 to 164,667 (two per cent of the number of the respective foreign nationalities resident in the United States in 1890). Under the provisions of this act, insular European countries are favored over the southeastern countries.

The chief quotas of the 1924 law are as follows:

TABLE LXVI  
*Yearly Quotas under Restriction Act of 1924*

Great Britain and Northern Ireland.....	34,007
Irish Free State.....	28,567
Germany .....	51,227
Italy .....	3,845
Poland .....	5,982
Russia .....	2,248

<sup>2</sup> Including Bessarabia.

<sup>3</sup> By Sept. 26, 1923, the maximum monthly quotas for the year ended June 30, 1924, had been exhausted for Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Fiume, Luxemburg, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Other Europe, Palestine, Syria, Other Asia, Africa, Egypt, Atlantic Islands, Australia, and Pacific Islands.

TABLE LXVI

Yearly Quotas under Restriction Act of 1924 (Continued)

Sweden .....	9,561
Czechoslovakia .....	3,073
Norway .....	6,453
Roumania .....	603
Austria .....	785
France .....	3,954
Denmark .....	2,789
Hungary .....	473
Greece .....	100
Spain .....	131
Portugal .....	503
Belgium .....	512
Switzerland .....	2,081

## 3. THE 1927 PROVISIONS OF THE RESTRICTION ACT OF 1924

Beginning July 1, 1927, the total number of immigrants to be admitted annually into the United States will be reduced to 150,000 and "national origin quotas" will go into effect.

Section II of the Act reads, in part, as follows:

The annual quota of any nationality for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1927, and for each fiscal year thereafter, shall be a number which bears the same ratio to 150,000 as the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920 having that national origin bears to the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920, but the minimum quota of any nationality shall be 100.

National origin shall be ascertained by determining as nearly as may be, in respect of each geographical area which is to be treated as a separate country the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920 whose origin by birth or ancestry is attributable to such geographical area. Such determination shall not be made by tracing the ancestors or descendants of particular individuals, but shall be based upon statistics of immigration and emigration, together with rates of increase of population as shown by successive decennial United States censuses, and such other data as may be found to be reliable.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> For full text of the Act of 1924 and for data on proposed methods of determining the national origin quotas cf. *Europe as an Emigrant-exporting Continent and the United States as an Immigrant-receiving Nation*. Hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, House of Representatives, Sixty-eighth Congress, First Session, March 8, 1924, Serial 5-A, Statement of Dr. Harry H. Laughlin, Washington, Govt. Printing Office, 1924. For a discussion of the motives, purposes, applications, and results of the "national origin" plan cf. Saguntinus, *The New Discrimination Act*, in *Columbia*, vol. IV, May, 1925.

## II. GENERAL IMMIGRATION STATISTICS

TABLE  
*Immigration,*

Country	1830	1840	1850	Decade Ended	
				1860	1870
Austria-Hungary .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7,800
Belgium .....	27	22	5,074	4,738	6,734
Denmark .....	169	1,063	539	3,749	17,094
France .....	8,497	45,575	77,202	76,358	35,984
Germany .....	6,761	152,454	434,626	951,667	787,468
Greece <sup>a</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Italy .....	408	2,253	1,870	9,231	11,728
Netherlands .....	1,078	1,412	8,251	10,789	9,102
Norway <sup>b</sup> .....	91	1,201	13,903	20,931	109,298
Sweden <sup>b</sup> .....	91	646	656	1,621	4,536
Spain .....	2,622	2,954	2,759	10,353	8,493
Portugal <sup>b</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Roumania <sup>a</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Switzerland .....	3,226	4,821	4,644	25,011	23,286
Turkey in Europe <sup>b</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
United Kingdom					
England .....	22,167	73,143	263,332	385,643	568,128
Scotland .....	2,912	2,667	3,712	38,331	38,768
Ireland .....	50,724	207,381	780,719	914,119	435,778
Wales <sup>c</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Europe, not specified.	43	96	155	116	210
Brit. No. America....	2,277	13,624	41,723	59,309	153,871
Mexico <sup>d</sup> .....	4,817	6,599	3,271	3,078	2,191
Central America.....	105	44	368	449	96
West Indies .....	3,834	12,301	13,528	10,060	9,043
South America.....	531	856	3,579	1,224	1,396
Islands of Atlantic...	352	103	337	3,090	3,446
China .....	2	8	35	41,397	64,301
India <sup>e</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Japan <sup>e</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Turkey in Asia <sup>e</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Other Asia .....	8	40	47	61	308
Oceania .....	2	9	29	158	221
Africa .....	16	52	55	210	312
All other .....	32,679	69,801	52,777	25,921	15,232
Grand total.....	143,439	599,125	1,713,251	2,598,214	2,314,824

<sup>a</sup> Included in "Europe, not specified," prior to 1891-1900.<sup>b</sup> Includes Serbia, Bulgaria, and Montenegro prior to 1920; included in "Europe, not specified," prior to 1891-1900; also, after 1919, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.<sup>c</sup> Not separately stated prior to 1891-1900.

## LXVII

1820-1920, by *Nationalities and Decades*

Decade ended					Country
1880	1890	1900	1910	1920	
72,969	353,719	597,047	2,145,266	896,342	Austria-Hungary <sup>a</sup>
7,221	20,177	20,062	41,635	33,746	Belgium
31,771	88,132	52,670	65,285	41,983	Denmark
72,206	50,464	36,006	73,379	61,897	France
718,182	1,452,970	543,922	341,498	143,945	Germany
.....	.....	15,996	167,519	184,201	Greece
55,759	307,309	655,694	2,045,877	1,109,524	Italy
16,541	53,701	31,816	48,262	43,718	Netherlands
211,245	568,362	{ 95,264	190,505	66,395	Norway
		{ 230,679	249,534	95,074	Sweden
52,254	265,088	593,703	1,597,306	921,957	Russia
9,893	6,535	{ 6,723	27,935	68,611	Spain
		{ 23,010	69,149	89,732	Portugal
.....	.....	14,559	53,008	13,311	Roumania
28,293	81,988	33,149	34,922	23,091	Switzerland
.....	.....	2,562	118,202	77,098	Turkey in Europe
					United Kingdom
460,479	657,488	271,094	388,017	249,944	England
87,564	149,869	60,053	120,469	78,601	Scotland
436,871	655,482	403,496	339,065	145,937	Ireland
.....	.....	11,186	17,464	13,107	Wales
656	10,318	4,370	1,719	18,350	Europe not specified
383,269	392,802	2,631	179,226	742,185	Brit. No. America
5,362	1,913	746	49,642	219,004	Mexico
210	462	1,183	8,112	17,159	Central America
13,957	29,042	35,040	107,548	123,424	West Indies
928	2,304	3,059	17,280	41,899	South America
10,056	15,798	.....	.....	.....	Atlantic Islands
123,201	61,711	23,166	20,605	21,278	China
.....	.....	26	4,713	2,082	India
.....	.....	26,855	129,797	83,837	Japan
.....	.....	8,398	77,393	79,389	Turkey in Asia
622	6,669	28,370	11,059	5,973	Other Asia
10,913	12,574	8,793	12,973	13,427	Oceania
229	437	1,343	7,368	8,443	Africa
1,540	1,299	1,749	33,654	1,147	All other
2,812,191	5,246,613	3,844,420	8,795,386	5,735,811	

<sup>a</sup> Immigrants from British North America and Mexico were not reported from 1886 to 1895, inclusive.

<sup>b</sup> Not separately enumerated prior to 1899.

<sup>c</sup> Cf. *S. A. U. S.*, p. 100.

The following table enables one to gauge the actuary probabilities in connection with foreign stocks here. The longer a nationality has been emigrating to this country the more old people will its stock here contain. It must be remembered, however, that this stock is not static, being replenished each year by new blood.

### III. ACTUARY PROBABILITIES

TABLE LXVIII\*

*White Population enumerated at the Census of 1790 and surviving at each Census Year: 1790-1900*

Year	Number	Whole population surviving of 1790 Per Cent	Died or departed fol. decade	
			Number	Per Cent of living in specified year
1790 .....	3,172,444	100.0	380,116	12.0
1800 .....	2,792,328	88.0	392,143	14.0
1810 .....	2,400,185	75.7	340,685	14.2
1820 .....	2,059,500	64.9	474,178	23.0
1830 .....	1,585,322	50.0	455,702	28.7
1840 .....	1,129,620	35.6	309,749	27.4
1850 .....	819,871	25.8	418,161	51.0
1860 .....	401,710	12.7	300,804	74.9
1870 .....	100,906	3.2	89,428	88.6
1880 .....	11,478	0.4	10,887	94.9
1890 .....	591	..	568	96.1
1900 .....	23	..	...	...

In computing the number of German Catholic immigrants no attempt was made to segregate them according to German states. The following table presents interesting statistics on this point.

### IV. GERMAN EMIGRATION BY STATES

TABLE LXIX

*German Emigration to the United States by German States, according to per cent Catholic, by Decades, 1880 to 1910*

State	Per Cent Cath.	Per Cent		
		1880-1890	1890-1900	1900-1910
Alsace-Lorraine .....	80.	8,027	4,500	6,000
Bavaria .....	70.	125,700	50,000	25,000
Baden .....	62.	60,000	26,000	10,000
Prussia .....	35.	836,092	323,910	159,330
Württemberg .....	30.	71,600	30,000	18,000
Hesse .....	30.	26,700	8,199	3,000
Oldenberg .....	20.	14,800	6,000	3,000
All other .....	3.	129,924	61,000	39,550

\* Cf. C. P. G., p. 82.

The states listed as "all other" comprise all the other states of the (then) German Empire not enumerated specifically. The per cent of Catholicity among them ranges from one-fifth of one per cent to about seven per cent, the average being about two or three per cent.

This table is compiled from statistics gathered from the *Statesman's Yearbook* for the years in question.

## V. TERRITORIAL POPULATION ACCESSION

TABLE LXXX\*

*Population of Areas added to the United States, 1800-1890, at the first Enumeration of their Inhabitants*

Enumerated first in	Population	
	Total	White
1810	97,401	51,538
1830	34,730	18,385
1840	49,563	42,862
1850	391,410	251,000 <sup>†</sup>
1860	182,528	175,705
1880	33,426	33,300
1890	258,657	117,368

### Areas

1810	Louisiana, Arkansas and Missouri
1830	Florida
1840	Minnesota and Iowa
1850	Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Washington, Oregon and California
1860	North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, and Nevada
1880	Alaska
1890	Indian Territory and Oklahoma

## VI. THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY

TABLE LXXI\*

*Development of the American Hierarchy by Decades*

### 1789-1800

Baltimore, 1789, a 1808; New Orleans, 1793, a 1850.

### 1811-1820

Charleston, 1820.

### 1801-1810

Boston, 1808, a 1875; New York, 1808, a 1850; Philadelphia, 1808, a 1875; Bardstown, 1808, to Louisville, 1841.

### 1821-1830

Cincinnati, 1821, a 1850; St. Louis, 1826, a 1847; Mobile, pa 1824, va 1825, d 1829; Richmond, 1821.

\* Compiled from data in *C. P. G.*, p. 55.

<sup>†</sup> Approximate. Official statistics are not in agreement.

\* a indicates erection of archdiocese; va, of vicariate apostolic; pa, of prefecture apostolic; d, or absence of initial, indicates erection of diocese.

TABLE LXXI—*Continued*

1831-1840	Peoria, 1877; Ogdensburg, Providence, 1872; San Antonio, 1874; Boston, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, Santa Fé, a 1875; Chicago, a 1880.
Dubuque, 1837, a 1893; Detroit, 1833; Vincennes, 1834, to Indianapolis, 1898; Nashville, 1837; Natchez, 1837.	
1841-1850	1881-1890
Chicago, 1843, a 1880; Milwaukee, 1843, a 1875; Oregon City, va 1843, a 1846; St. Paul, 1850, a 1888; Santa Fé, 1850, a 1875; Albany, Buffalo, Cleveland, Galveston, 1847; Hartford, 1843; Little Rock, 1843; Monterey and Los Angeles, 1850; Pittsburgh, 1843; Savannah, 1850; Walla Walla, 1846, to Nesqually 1850, to Seattle 1907; Wheeling, 1850; Bardstown to Louisville, 1841; New York, Cincinnati, New Orleans, a 1850; St. Louis, a 1847.	Bellville, Cheyenne, Concordia, 1887; Dallas, 1890; Davenport, 1881; Denver, 1887; Duluth, 1889; Fargo, 1889; Grand Rapids, 1882; Helena, 1884; Lincoln, 1887; Manchester, 1884; Omaha, 1885; Sacramento, 1886; St. Cloud, 1889; Salt Lake, va 1886, d 1891; Sioux Falls, 1889; Syracuse, 1886; Trenton, 1881; Wichita, 1887; Winona, 1889; St. Paul, a 1888.
1851-1860	1891-1900
San Francisco, a 1853; Natchitoches, 1853, to Alexandria, 1910; Quincy, 1853, to Alton, 1857, to Springfield (Ill.), 1923; Brooklyn, Burlington, Covington, Erie, 1853; Ft. Wayne, 1857; Marquette, va 1853, d 1857; Newark, 1853; Omaha, va 1857, d 1885; Portland, 1853; St. Augustine, va 1857, d 1870.	Boise, 1893; Oklahoma, va 1891, d 1905; Salt Lake, 1891; Tucson, 1897; Dubuque, a 1893; Vincennes to Indianapolis, 1898.
1861-1870	1901-1910
Boise, va 1868, d 1887; Denver, do.; Columbus, Green Bay, Harrisburg, La Crosse, Rochester, St. Joseph, Scranton, 1868; Marysville, va 1861, to Grass Valley, 1868, to Sacramento, 1886; St. Augustine, 1870; Springfield (Mass.), 1870; Wilmington, 1868; Tucson, va 1868, d 1897; No. Carolina, va 1868.	Altoona, 1901; Baker City, 1903; Lead, 1902; Bismarck, 1910; Crookston, 1910; Fall River, Great Falls, 1904; Oklahoma, 1905; Rockford, 1908; Sioux City, 1902; Superior, 1905; Toledo, 1910; Nesqually to Seattle, 1907; Natchitoches to Alexandria, 1910.
1871-1880	1911-1925
Corpus Christi, va 1874, d 1912; Kansas City, 1880; Leavenworth,	Corpus Christ, 1912; Des Moines, 1911; El Paso, 1914; Kearney, 1912, to Grand Island, 1917; Lafayette, 1918; Spokane, 1913; Ruthenian Greek, 1913; Alaska, va 1916; Alton to Springfield (Ill.), 1923; Monterey and Los Angeles divided into Los Angeles and San Diego; and Monterey and Fresno, 1922; Raleigh, 1924.

## VII. CONVERSIONS

TABLE LXXII

*Statistics of Conversions in the United States by Dioceses, 1918-1920\**

Diocese	1918	1919	1920	Diocese	1918	1919	1920
Baltimore .....	1,168	1,183	918	Chicago <sup>9</sup> .....	....	....	....
Boston .....	1,083	1,062	1,125	Cincinnati .....	594	490	648

<sup>\*</sup> Cf. *Catholic Directory*, 1919, 1920, 1921.<sup>9</sup> A blank indicates that no returns were received.

TABLE LXXII—Continued

Diocese	1918	1919	1920	Diocese	1918	1919	1920
Dubuque .....	379	276	267	Leavenworth ..	260	300	350
Milwaukee .....	525	560	604	Kansas City....	....	....	390
New Orleans..	298	307	566	La Crosse .....	....	....	290
New York....	1,997	1,997	1,997	Lead .....	165	75	77
Oregon City....	....	....	....	Lafayette .....	....	76	17
Philadelphia ..	1,722	1,552	1,827	Lincoln .....	98	103	92
St. Louis .....	....	....	....	Little Rock....	134	148	110
St. Paul .....	....	....	....	Louisville .....	293	335	312
San Francisco.	513	513	412	Manchester .....	197	....	....
Santa Fé .....	....	....	60	Marquette .....	....	....	....
Albany .....	....	....	....	Mobile .....	637	571	531
Alexandria ....	63	103	84	Monterey & L.A.	409	409	409
Alton .....	297	323	997	Nashville .....	237	157	169
Altoona .....	75	110	112	Natchez .....	253	....	126
Baker City....	72	75	48	Newark .....	318	476	476
Belleville .....	139	137	127	Ogdensburg .....	250	275	300
Bismarck .....	89	89	87	Oklahoma .....	255	197	179
Boise .....	135	93	230	Omaha .....	274	261	310
Brooklyn .....	1,460	....	....	Peoria .....	561	....	....
Buffalo .....	....	....	....	Pittsburgh .....	818	901	884
Burlington .....	230	224	235	Portland .....	....	....	....
Charleston ....	62	75	99	Providence .....	....	....	....
Cheyenne .....	85	82	92	Richmond .....	463	468	468
Cleveland .....	921	729	716	Rochester .....	341	390	336
Columbus .....	570	....	521	Rockford .....	140	173	186
Concordia ....	301	301	298	Sacramento .....	....	....	....
Corpus Christi.	45	60	58	St. Augustine..	126	153	126
Covington .....	154	204	217	St. Cloud .....	161	161	161
Crookston ....	80	60	75	St. Joseph....	250	....	....
Dallas .....	270	320	308	Salt Lake .....	63	71	52
Davenport ....	202	139	187	San Antonio..	222	252	215
Denver .....	390	397	284	Savannah .....	186	240	266
Des Moines....	161	161	180	Scranton .....	264	154	145
Detroit .....	1,194	....	901	Seattle .....	292	310	319
Duluth .....	118	155	164	Sioux City....	250	230	228
El Paso .....	....	84	79	Sioux Falls....	219	198	188
Erie .....	....	....	....	Spokane .....	129	130	137
Fall River ....	152	114	95	Springfield .....	....	....	....
Fargo .....	127	121	121	Superior .....	121	125	101
Fort Wayne...	416	505	410	Syracuse .....	....	316	316
Galveston .....	215	224	224	Toledo .....	348	317	359
Grand Island..	88	87	118	Trenton .....	357	382	294
Grand Rapids..	263	395	442	Tucson .....	....	....	....
Great Falls....	....	....	....	Wheeling .....	159	190	160
Green Bay....	314	314	314	Wichita .....	174	146	146
Harrisburg ...	190	100	130	Wilmington ...	75	60	75
Hartford .....	510	400	412	Winona .....	250	100	100
Helena .....	148	....	115	No. Carolina..	40	58	81
Indianapolis ..	472	496	467	Total .....	24,552	23,625	28,376



## INDEX

Acadians, 49 *ff.*  
 Act, Census, 202  
     Conventicle, 42  
     Corporation, 42  
     Drake Constitution, 152  
     Edict of Nantes, 50, 51  
     Emancipation, 78, 116  
     Embargo, 64  
     Factory, 120  
     Five Mile, 42  
     Irish Land Acts, 78, 148, 164  
     Municipal Reform, 120  
     Naturalization Acts, 51  
     Non-Importation, 64  
     Occasional Conformity, 41  
     Parliamentary Reform, 120  
     Quarter-acre, 139  
     Quebec, 50  
     Test, 42  
     Test-oath, 152  
     Toleration, 41  
 Actuary probabilities, 276  
 Age, Catholics by, 212  
 Agrarian, problem, 78  
     troubles, 148  
         in Austria, 87, 156, 173  
 Alaska, vicariate, 182  
 Albany, diocese, 132  
 Alexander II, 155, 163  
     III, 163  
 Alexandria, diocese, 144, 178  
 Aliens, debarred, 104  
     defined, 271  
     emigrants, 100, 103  
     immigrants, 74, 114, 115  
     length of residence of, 104, 105  
 Alsace-Lorraine, 158, 180  
 Alton, diocese, 144  
 Altoona, diocese, 178  
 American College, in Rome, 144  
 Annapolis, Catholic cadets, 143  
 Anti-Catholic feeling in Civil War,  
     151, 152  
         in France, 157, 163  
     laws, in America, 41  
     legislation, in Austria, 156  
         in Germany, 158  
     movements, 131, 140 *ff.*, 166  
     outbreaks, 125, 130 *ff.*, 142  
     "A. P. A.'s," 166  
     Apostolic Delegation, 172  
     Auburn, 115  
     Augsburg, Confession, 45  
         Religious Peace, 45  
     Austria-Hungary, emigration from,  
         86  
         by religion, 108  
         land problem in, 87, 156, 173  
         naturalization, 140  
         return movement to, 100  
         war with Prussia, 147, 156  
     Avenel, d', 107  
 Baker City, diocese, 178  
 Baltimore, archdiocese, 72  
     diocese, 61  
     Council, provincial, 116  
         plenary, 144, 151, 153, 166  
         riot in, 131  
         visit of Bedini, 143  
 Baltimore, Lord, 58  
 Baptisms, as census basis, 189 *ff.*  
*Baptist Almanac*, 136  
 Bardstown, diocese, 72  
 Barber family, 63  
 Bath, riot in, 143  
 Bayley, Bishop, 143  
 Bedini, Archbp., 143  
 Belfast, 43  
 Belleville, diocese, 166  
 Berlin, Conference of 1890, 168  
     Congress of, 162  
 Bible-reading in public schools, 142  
 Bill of Rights, 54, 55  
 Birth rate, among foreign-born,  
     185 *ff.*, 191 *ff.*  
     in Ireland, 97  
     in U. S., 187, 188, 192  
 Bismarck, 147, 158  
 Bismarck, diocese, 178  
 "Bloody Monday," 143  
 Boise, diocese, 172  
     vicariate, 143  
 Booth, 152  
 Bosnia, 162  
 Boston, alleged Catholic loss, 204,  
     209  
     archdiocese, 161

Boston, diocese, 72  
 fire, 159  
 riot in, 143  
 visit of Bedini, 143

British, immigration, character of, 83  
 impermanence of, 84, 102, 103  
 stock, 234 *ff.*

Brooklyn, diocese, 144  
 riot in, 143

Buffalo, diocese, 132

Burlington, diocese, 144  
 riot in, 125

Business depression, and immigration, 90  
*see* Panic

Butt, Isaac, 79, 158

Cahenslyism, 231 *ff.*

California, 139

Cambridge, alleged Catholic loss, 204, 209

Canevin, Archbp., 188 *ff.*, 245

Carolina, Catholics in, in 1790, 53

Carroll, Bishop and Archbp., 29, 61  
 1785 estimate by, 29  
 1789 estimate by, 36, 37, 38, 184  
 prefect apostolic, 60

Carthage, 115

Catholic, census, no general, 33, 197  
 Denver diocesan, 201  
 churches, languages in, 218 *ff.*

Directory, 197 *ff.*, 234

Encyclopedia, 178

immigration, *see* Immigration, decadal tables, 274 *ff.*, *etc.*

leakage, 246 *ff.*  
*see* Loss

local organizations, 199

names, 246, 247

natural increase, *see* Natural increase

population, in 1789, 36, 37  
 in 1790, 52  
 in 1820, 72  
 in 1830, 117 *ff.*  
 in 1840, 125, 126  
 tripled, 1841 to 1850, 133, 135  
 in 1860, 145  
 in 1870, 153  
 in 1880, 161  
 in 1890, 165  
 in 1900, 169, 171  
 in 1910, 175, 177, 178  
 in 1920, 180, 181, 197 *ff.*  
 alleged loss, 204 *ff.*  
 computation of, 77, 106 *ff.*  
 estimates, 1890 to 1920, 211  
 scattered, 259

Catholic, school system, 249  
 stock, by decades, 251  
 original, 251

University of America, 166

Catholics, in France, 106, 107  
 in Ireland, 108 *ff.*  
 in other European countries, 107 *ff.*  
 colored, 37, 183  
 by age and sex, 212  
 in respective colonies, 53, 54  
 legal position of, 54  
 persecution of, in Acadia, 49  
 in Ireland, 41 *ff.*

"Catholics," definition of, 214 *ff.*  
 minimum, 218

Cavour, 138

Celtic stock, 241

Census, Act, 202  
 Denver diocesan, 201  
 no Catholic, 33, 197  
 religious statistics, 197 *ff.*, 202

Challoner, Bishop, 58, 59

Charles I, 41  
 II, 41  
 X, 119

Charleston, diocese, 115, 253  
 Bishop England, 224 *ff.*

Charlestown, convent burned, 125  
 riot in, 143

Chartist agitation, 120, 128

Chelsea, riot in, 143

Cheyenne, diocese, 166

Chicago, archdiocese, 161  
 Catholic population, 201  
 diocese, 132  
 fire, 159

Cholera epidemic, 121, 124, 128, 133

Church problems, 257 *ff.*

Cincinnati, archdiocese, 132  
 Catholic population, 201, 204, 209  
 diocese, 115  
 visit of Bedini, 143

Civil War, 90, 146, 148  
 priests and nuns in, 151

Cleveland, diocese, 132

Coakley, Rev. T. F., 243

Colored, Catholics, 37, 183  
 natural increase, 177, 182  
 in U. S., in 1790 and 1840, 228;  
 in 1870, 232, 241

Columbus, alleged Catholic loss, 204, 209  
 diocese, 153

Conclusions, 221, 222

Concordat, of 1801, 157  
 of 1855, 156

Concordia, diocese, 166

Confederation, German, 147  
 North German, 146  
 of the Rhine, 147

Confession, Augsburg, 45

Confession, seal of in court, 143

Congregation de Propaganda Fide, 177

Congress of Berlin, 162  
 of Vienna, 113, 146

Connecticut, Catholics in, in 1790, 53  
 constitution and religion, 57

Constitution, Federal, 54  
 of respective States, 56 *ff.*

Contract-labor Law, 103

Conventicle Act, 42

Conversions, basis of computation, 71  
 statistics of, 278  
*see* decadal summary tables, 278 *ff.*

Convert stock, by decades, 251

Corn laws, 121

Corporation Act, 42

Corpus Christi, diocese, 182  
 vicariate, 161

Covington, diocese, 144

"Coxey's Army," 168

Crimean War, 138

Crookston, diocese, 178

Cromwell, 36, 41, 49

Cumberland road, 115

Dallas, diocese, 166

Dalmatia, 162

Darboy, Archbp., 157

D'Avenel, 107

Davenport, diocese, 166

Dayton, alleged Catholic loss, 204, 209

Death rate, in Ireland, 97  
 among foreign-born, 185 *ff.*, 191 *ff.*  
 among Irish-born, 129  
 in U. S., 187, 188, 192

Deaths, actuary probabilities, 276  
 deduction for, 75

Delaware, Catholics in 1790, 53  
 constitution and religion, 57

Denver, diocese, 166  
 Catholic census, 201  
 vicariate, 153

Deportation, of Irish, 41  
 of Acadians, 49 *ff.*

Derry, 43

Des Moines, diocese, 182

Detroit, diocese, 124  
 early Catholics, 37

Dioceses, large area, 260  
 number of in various countries, 268

Directory, Catholic, 197 *ff.*, 234  
 Hoffman's, 233  
 Sadlier's, 162, 167

Discrimination against Catholics, 56 *ff.*  
*see* Catholic; Anti-Catholic; Law; Act; *etc.*

Dissenters, 41, 42

Doane, G. H., 143

Dorchester, riot in, 143

Douglas, Stephen, 143

Drake Constitution, 152

DuBois, Bishop, 124

Dubuque, archdiocese, 172  
 Catholic population, 201  
 diocese, 124

Duluth, diocese, 166

Dunkards, 46

Dutch, in U. S., before 1790, 45 *ff.*  
 intolerance of, 47  
 stock, in 1870 and 1890, 232 *ff.*

Edict of Nantes, 50, 51

Elder, Bishop, 152

El Paso, diocese, 182

Ellsworth, riot in, 143

Emancipation Act, 78, 116

Emigrant-aid Societies, 67, 265

Emigration, by age and sex, 99  
 Catholic, 98  
 deduction for, 75 *ff.*  
 European, causes of, 75 *ff.*  
 German, 276 *ff.*  
 important factor, 32, 98  
 Irish Protestant, 78  
 to British Isles, 77, 100, 101  
 to Europe, 100, 101  
 to Italy, 102

length of residence here, 104, 105

U. S. (from), 65 *ff.*  
 1871 to 1880, 160  
 1881 to 1890, 164  
 1891 to 1900, 169 *ff.*  
 1901 to 1910, 175, 176  
 1911 to 1920, 180 *ff.*

Emmett, Robert, 79

England, and Crimean War, 138  
 poor-law in, 80  
 return movement to, 66, 77  
*see* British

England, Bishop, estimate by, 126,  
 184, 225, 229, 253  
 estimates of, analyzed, 231  
 statement of, 224 *ff.*, 240

English, *see* British  
 language, 242, 243

Erie Canal, 90, 114, 115

Erie, diocese, 144

Established Churches, 56 *ff.*

Evansville, alleged Catholic loss, 204, 209  
 Extension Society, Catholic Church, 261

Factory Act, 120  
 Fall River, diocese, 178  
 Famine, Irish, 79, 110, 127, 128, 139  
 Fargo, diocese, 166  
 Farm lands, consolidation of, 80, 81, 138  
 Federal Constitution, 54, 55  
 Female, emigration, 193  
 and male immigration, 92 *ff.*, 182  
 Catholics, 212  
 Fenians, 79, 148  
 Fillmore, President, 142  
 Five Mile Act, 42  
 Florida, acquisition of, 69, 228  
 vicariate of, 144, 153  
 Foreign-born, by districts, 252  
 fecundity of, 92, 95  
 illiteracy of, 264  
 in Northern States, 255  
 in Southern States, 232, 252 *ff.*  
 languages of Catholic, 218 *ff.*  
 marriage rate among, 95, 193  
 natural-increase rate, 185 *ff.*, 191 *ff.*  
 preponderance of males, 92  
 Foreign-born increase, 194, 195  
*Fortnightly Review*, 243  
 Fort Wayne, diocese, 144  
 Forty Hours Devotion, 145  
 Fox, 45  
 France, Catholics in, 106, 107  
 and Crimean War, 138  
 immigration and emigration, 100  
 Franco-Prussian War, 157 *ff.*  
 French, in Canada, 48, 49  
 Canadian Seminary, 49  
 loss to Church, 50, 246  
 priests emigrate, 67, 158, 163  
 Revolution, 63  
 royalists, 120  
 stock, in 1870 and 1890, 232 *ff.*  
 in U. S., 48 *ff.*  
 Friends, Society of, 45

Gadsden Purchase, 130, 145  
 Galveston, diocese, 132  
 riot in, 143  
 Garibaldi, 86, 139  
 Georgia, Catholics in, 53  
 constitution and religion, 57  
 Germans, in U. S., before 1790, 45 *ff.*  
 in 1870 and 1890, 232 *ff.*  
 found Newburgh, 46

Germans, loss to Church, 48, 246  
 Palatines, 46  
 Germantown, 46  
 Germany, emigration from by States, 276  
 emigration and military service, 81  
 Jews and radicals from, 82, 127, 141  
 return movement to, 100  
 unification of, 147  
 Gibbons, Cardinal, 166  
 Gladstone, 164  
 Glennon, Archbp., 202  
 Goetz, 61  
 Gold, discovery of, 90, 130, 139, 168  
 Goldenweiser, E. A., 211, 212, 216  
 Grand Island, diocese, 182  
 Grand Rapids, diocese, 166  
 Grass Valley, diocese, 143, 166  
 Grattan, Henry, 79  
 Great Britain, *see* England  
 Great Falls, diocese, 178  
 Green Bay, diocese, 153

Harrisburg, diocese, 153  
 Hartford, diocese, 132  
 Hecker, Fr., 144  
 Helbron, 61  
 Helena, diocese, 166  
 Herrnhuters, 45, 46  
 Herzegovina, 162  
 Hessians, 47  
 Hierarchy, development of, 258, 277  
*see* text at decadal tables  
 Hoffman's Directory, 233  
 Hogan, 116  
 Home Rule, 78, 79, 158, 164, 168  
 Hudson Bay Territory, 49  
 Hughes, Bishop, 131, 152, 249  
 Huguenots, 50

Illiteracy, among foreign-born, 264  
 in U. S., 264  
 Immigrants, classification of 74, 103  
 distribution of, 250 *ff.*  
 length of residence here, 104, 105  
 preponderance of males, 92, 182  
 Immigration, British, character of, 83  
 Catholic, computation of, 77  
 causes of, 77 *ff.*, 89  
 computation of net, 75  
*see* Emigration  
 general statistics, 274, 275  
 Italian, character of, 84  
 starts, 139  
 net and gross, 65 *ff.*

Immigration, new, 173  
by religion, 244

Immigration Law, of 1819, 74  
of 1875, 103  
of 1891, 103  
of 1921, 271  
of 1924, 272  
of 1927, 273

Immigrational, Catholic stock, 251  
increase, 194, 195

Immigration-restriction laws, 271 ff.

Increase, natural, *see* Natural increase  
phenomenal Catholic, 263

Independence, War of, 59

India, Sepoy Mutiny, 138

Indian, Catholics, 53, 183

Indianapolis, alleged Catholic loss, 204, 209  
diocese, 124, 172

Insurrection of 1641, 41

Ireland, agrarian problem, 78, 158  
Catholics and Protestants in, 108 ff.  
decrease of population, 111  
emigration from, 110  
Fenians, 79, 148  
Great Famine, 79, 139  
Home Rule, 78, 158, 164, 168  
immigration to, 109, 110  
mortality rate in, 97  
potato blight of 1821, 79  
potato crop and emigration, 79, 128, 164  
return movement to, 66, 77, 100  
Young Ireland Party, 78

Irish, alleged apostasy of, 31, 241 ff.  
deportation of, 41  
emigration, by provinces, 110  
and potato crop, 79, 128, 164  
famine, 110, 127, 128  
immigration before 1790, 39 ff.  
Land Acts, 78, 148, 164  
loss to Church, 44, 246  
mortality among, 79, 129  
National League, 158, 164  
nonconformists, 40  
over-population, 79  
population by decades, 97  
Protestant, 44  
stock in 1870 and 1890, 232 ff.

Tract, 42  
weavers, 42  
in Virginia and Massachusetts, 40  
So. Carolina, 41, 42  
U. S., in 1790, 43

"Irish Church," disestablishment of, 78, 148

Italian, character of immigration, 84  
Protestants, 220, 221  
stock, in 1870 and 1890, 232 ff.

Italy, and Crimean War, 138  
movement from, starts, 139, 156  
result of emigration, 173  
return movement to, 66, 100, 102  
unification of, 85, 86, 157

Ives, Levi S., 143

James II, 40, 41

Jay, John, 56

*Jesuit, The*, 116

Jesuits, in Maryland, 58  
Swiss expelled, 134

Jewish problem, in Germany, 163  
in Russia, 78, 87, 163, 167, 174

Jews, from Germany, 141  
from Russia, 163

Josephism, 156, 249

July Monarchy, 127

July Revolution, 119

Jurisdiction, New Orleans and Baltimore, 115  
question of, 59 ff.

"*Jus Reformandi*," 45

Kansas City, diocese, 161

Kearney, diocese, 182

Knights of Labor, 166

Know-Nothing movement, 131 ff., 140, 142, 143

*Kulturkampf*, 158, 163, 249

Labor, Knights of, 166  
laws, 163, 168  
wages in Austria, 173, 174

La Crosse, diocese, 153

Lafayette, diocese, 182

Laidlaw, Dr., 213

Land League, 158, 164

Land-tenure, in Austria, 87, 156, 173  
in England, 80, 81  
in Ireland, 78, 80, 148, 158  
in Russia, 88, 155  
in Scotland, 81

Language, English and religion, 243

Languages, used by Catholics, 218 ff.

Latin America, independence of, 113

Laughlin, Dr. H. H., 273

Law, *see* Act  
Anti-Catholic laws, 41, 156, 158  
Bill of Rights, 54, 55  
contract-labor, 103  
corn laws, 121  
poor-law, 80  
immigration laws, 74, 103, 271, 272, 273  
labor laws, 163, 168

Law, May laws, 158  
 "Nunnery Inspection" laws, 142  
 penal laws, 41, 56 *ff.*

Lawrence, riot in, 143

Lead, diocese, 178

League, Irish National, 158, 164  
 Land, 158, 164  
 Protestant, 132  
 Sonderbund, 138

Leakage, Catholic, 246 *ff.*  
*see* Loss

Leavenworth, diocese, 161

Legal position of Catholics in 1790, 54

Lewis, Fr. John, 59, 60

Liberty, religious, rise of, 56 *ff.*

Lincoln, assassination of, 152

Lincoln, diocese, 166

Little Rock, diocese, 132

Los Angeles, diocese, 278

Loss, alleged Catholic, 223 *ff.*  
 Catholic, 204 *ff.*, 255  
 conclusions as to, 221, 222

Louis XIV, 50

Louisiana, early Catholicity in, 70

Louisiana Purchase, 69, 70, 228

Louis Philippe, 119, 127

Louisville, alleged Catholic loss, 210  
 diocese, 277, 278  
 riot in, 143

Loyalists in Florida, 69

Lucerne Memorial, 231 *ff.*

McFaul, Bishop, statement of, 241

McGee, T. D., 241

McCloskey, Cardinal, 161

Maine, Catholics in 1790, 53

Malden, alleged Catholic loss, 204, 210

Male, and female, immigration, 92 *ff.*, 182  
 Catholics, 212  
 emigration, 99, 193

Manchester, diocese, 166  
 riot in, 143

Marbois, 37

Marechal, Archbp., 69, 71  
 1820 estimate, 72, 117, 136, 184

Marquette, diocese, 144

Marriage rate, among foreign-born, 95  
 among foreign stock, 96, 193  
 among native stock, 96

Maryland, Catholics in 1790, 53  
 constitution and religion, 57

Marysville, vicariate, 153, 166

Massachusetts, Catholics in 1790, 53  
 constitution and religion, 56

Massillon, riot in, 143

Mather, Cotton, 41

May laws, 158

Memorial, of American priests, 61  
 Knights of Labor, 166  
 Lucerne, 231 *ff.*

Mennonites, 45, 46

Meriam, Lewis, 213

Methods of computation, 34, 75, 185, 188 *ff.*

Mexican War, 130

Milwaukee, archdiocese, 161  
 diocese, 132

Mobile, diocese, 115

Monterey, diocese, 132, 182

Moravians, 47

Mortality, high among Irish, 97, 129, 187

Mullen, Fr., 242

Municipal Reform Act, 120

Murray's Table, 135, 145

Myers, Gustavus, 213

Names, Catholic, 246, 247

Nantes, Edict of, 50, 51

Napoleon I, fall of, 65  
 III, 127, 138, 147

Nashville, diocese, 124

Natchez, diocese, 124

Natchitoches, diocese, 144, 178

National Catholic Welfare Conference, 265

Native Americanists, 143

Natural increase, basis of computation, 68, 185  
 decadal rates, 95, 97, 189, 190  
 factors affecting foreign-born, 92 *ff.*  
 foreign-born, 185 *ff.*, 191 *ff.*  
 in Ireland, 97  
 in U. S., 187, 188, 192  
 Negro, 177, 182  
*see* Catholic population

Naturalization, Acts, 51  
 right of, 140

Negro, *see* Colored

Nesqually, diocese, 132, 178

Newark, diocese, 144

Newburgh, 46

Newcastle, 42

Newry, 43

Newfoundland, 49

New Hampshire, Catholics in 1790, 53  
 constitution and religion, 56

New Jersey, Catholics in 1790, 53  
 constitution and religion, 57

New Mexico, 134, 145

New Orleans, archdiocese, 132  
 diocese, 72

New York, archdiocese, 132  
 Catholics in, 53, 201  
 constitution and religion, 56, 57  
 diocese, 72  
 riot in, 131  
 World's Fair, 139

Nihilists, 155

Nonconformists, 40

Non-professants in France, 107

North Carolina, constitution and religion, 57  
 diocese of Raleigh, 279  
 vicariate, 153

Norwalk, riot in, 143

"Nunnery Inspection" laws, 142

"Nuns of the Battlefield" monument, 151

Occasional Conformity Act, 41

O'Connell, Daniel, 79

Ogdensburg, diocese, 161

O'Hara, E. V., 213

Oklahoma, diocese, 178  
 vicariate, 172

Omaha, diocese, 166  
 vicariate, 144

"Open villages," 81

Oregon City, vicariate and archdiocese, 132

Oxford movement, 143

Palatines, 46

"Pale," the, 88

Palmyra, riot in, 143

Panic of, 1837, 121, 122  
 1857, 140  
 1873, 159  
 1893, 168

Paris, Treaty of, 50

Parish, subdivision of, 208

Parishes, in certain cities, 209, 210  
 in certain States, 207

Parliamentary Reform Act, 120

Parnell, Charles, 79, 158, 164

Paulist Society, founded, 144

Peace, of Augsburg, 45  
 of Westphalia, 45  
 of Zurich, 86

Penal, laws, 41, 56 *ff.*  
 code, 42

Penn, William, 45, 46

Pennsylvania. Catholic population in 1790, 54  
 religion and constitution, 57  
 route, 115

Peoria, alleged Catholic loss, 204, 209  
 diocese, 161

Persecution, of Catholics, in Acadia, 49  
 in Ireland, 41 *ff.*  
 of Huguenots, 51

Petition to Rome, 59

Philadelphia, archdiocese, 161  
 diocese, 72  
 riot in, 132

Pietists, 45

Pittsburgh, diocese, 132

Polish, Revolution, 120  
 insurrection, 148  
 in Germany, 163  
 immigrants classed separately, 171, 174, 176, 177, 180

Poor-Law, English, 80

Population, Catholic, *see* Catholic colored in 1790 and 1840, 228  
 in 1870, 232  
 increase in South, 253  
 westward movement of, 123, 144

Portland, diocese, 144

Potato crop, and Irish emigration, 79, 128, 164

Poterie, de la, 61

Priests, decadal numbers, 262  
 distribution of, 259  
 lack of, 250 *ff.*  
 lack of trustworthy, 37, 116, 226

Propagation of the Faith, Society of, 224, 226

Protection policy, 121, 122

Protestant, Irish, 78, 108 *ff.*  
 Italians, 220, 221

"Protestant League," 132

Providence, alleged Catholic loss, 204, 209  
 diocese, 161  
 riot in, 142

Prussia, emigration and military service, 81, 82  
 war with Austria-Hungary, 147, 156  
 war with France, 157

Quakers, 45, 46

Quarter-acre Act, 139

Quassaick, 46

Quebec Act, 50

Quincy, alleged Catholic loss, 204, 210  
 diocese, 144

Quota Law, 103, 271 *ff.*

Radicals, from Germany, 82, 127, 141

Railroads, growth of, 122, 139, 148, 159, 164  
 strike, 159

Raleigh, diocese, 279  
*Religious Bodies*, 197 *ff.*  
 Religious, clauses of the Constitution, 54  
 liberty, slow rise of in States, 56 *ff.*  
 oppression, 78, 163  
     *see* Discrimination; Persecution  
 statistics, 197 *ff.*, 202  
 "Remonstrance," 60  
 "Rerum Novarum," 166  
 Residence of aliens, length of, 104, 105  
 Return movement from U. S., 65 *ff.*, 84, 85, 98 *ff.*  
     and net immigration, 75 *ff.*  
 Revolution, French, 63  
     July, 119  
     Polish, 120  
     of 1848, 126 *ff.*  
 Revolutionary unrest in Europe, 120, 148  
 Rhode Island, Catholics in 1790, 53  
     constitution and religion, 57  
 Richmond, diocese, 115  
 Robinson, W. E., 241  
 Rochester, 115; diocese, 153  
 Rockford, Catholic population, 201  
     diocese, 178  
 Ross, Rev. J., 213  
 Rossiter, W. S., 193  
 Rousselot, Fr., 61  
 Roxbury, riot in, 143  
 Royalists, French, 120  
 Russia, abolition of serfdom, 88, 155  
     Crimean War, 138  
     emigration from, 87  
     Jews in, 78, 87, 163, 167, 174  
 Ruthenian-Greek diocese, 182  
 St. Augustine, diocese, 153  
     vicariate, 144  
 St. Cloud, diocese, 166  
 St. Joseph, diocese, 153  
 St. Louis, archdiocese, 132  
     diocese, 115  
     visit of Bedini, 143  
 St. Paul, archdiocese, 166  
     diocese, 132  
 Sacramento, diocese, 166  
 Sadlier's Directory, estimate, 162, 167  
 Salzburger Protestants, 47  
 Salt Lake City, diocese, 172  
     vicariate, 166  
 San Antonio, diocese, 161  
 San Francisco, archdiocese, 144  
 Santa Fé, archdiocese, 161  
     diocese, 132  
 Saugerties, riot in, 143  
 Sault Ste. Marie, diocese, 144  
 Savannah, diocese, 132  
 Saxe-Gotha district, 47  
 Scandinavian stock, 232 *ff.*  
 Schemm, Prof., estimate by, 135  
 Schisms, attempts at, 61  
     Hogan, 116  
     Philadelphia, 124  
     Sedella, 116  
 Schleswig-Holstein War, 146  
 Schoharie, 46  
 Schools, Catholic, 249  
 Schwenkfelders, 45  
 Scranton, diocese, 153  
 Seattle, diocese, 178  
 Sedella, 116  
 Seminaries, foundation of, 123  
 Sepoy Mutiny, 138  
 Serfdom, abolition of, in Russia, 88, 155  
 Seton, Mrs., 63, 143  
 Seven, Weeks' War, 146  
     Years' War, 50  
 Sex, Catholics by, 212  
     emigration by, 99  
     immigration by, 92 *ff.*, 182  
 Shea, J. G., estimate by, 135, 153  
 Shenandoah Valley, 46  
 Siberia, 88  
 Sidney, riot in, 143  
 Sioux City, diocese, 178  
 Sioux Falls, diocese, 166  
 Slavery, abolition of, in Britain, 120, 121  
 Society, Extension, 261  
     of Friends, 45  
     of Jesus, 58  
     Paulist, 144  
     of Propagation of the Faith, 224, 226  
 Societies, Emigrant-aid, 265  
 Sonderbund, League and War, 138  
 South, foreign-born in, 230, 252 *ff.*  
     increase in population in, 253  
 South Carolina, constitution and religion, 57  
 Spalding, Archbp., 240  
 Spanish-American War, 168  
 Spanish Succession, War of, 49  
 Spokane, diocese, 182  
 Springfield, Ill., diocese, 144  
     alleged Catholic loss, 204, 209  
     Mass., diocese, 153  
 State constitutions, and religious liberty, 56 *ff.*  
 Sulpicians, 67  
 Superior, diocese, 178  
 Surratt, Mrs., 152

Switzerland, religious conditions in, 138  
 Syracuse, diocese, 166

Talbot, Bishop, 59  
 Taney, Roger, 152  
 Tardivel, J., 241, 244  
 Tariff, and immigration, 90, 167  
 "of abominations," 121  
 "woolen—of 1828," 121  
 Taylor, Zachary, 142  
 Teeling case, 143  
 Territorial increase, 69 *ff.*, 134, 145, 228, 277  
 Territory, diocesan, 260  
 Test Act, 42; in Kentucky, 152  
 Thayer family, 63  
 Thirty Years' War, 45, 48  
 Toledo, diocese, 178  
 Toleration Act, 41  
 Trans-Atlantic, Passenger Association, 100  
 cable, 148  
 Treaty, of Paris, 50; of Utrecht, 49  
 Trenton, diocese, 166  
 Trusteeism, 61, 116, 124, 125, 130, 249  
*Truth Teller, The*, 116  
 Tucson, diocese, 172  
 vicariate, 143  
 Turenne, 48  
 Turkey, Crimean War, 138

Ulster, emigrants in 1719, 42  
*see* Ireland  
 United Brethren, 46  
*United States Catholic Miscellany*, 116  
 Utica, 115  
 Utrecht, Treaty of, 49

Vergennes, 38  
 Vermont, Catholics in 1790, 53  
 Vienna, Congress of, 113, 146  
 Villeneuve, Abbé, 233 *ff.*  
 estimates of, analyzed, 240  
 Vincennes, diocese, 124, 172

Virginia, Catholics in 1790, 53  
 constitution and religion, 57  
 Von Steinwehr, Gen., 232

Walburg, Rev. A. H., 233  
 Walla Walla, diocese, 132  
 War, Austro-Prussian, 147, 156  
 China and Gt. Britain, 138  
 Civil, 90, 146, 148  
 Crimean, 138  
 Franco-English, 64  
 Franco-Prussian, 157  
 French Revolution, 64  
 Mexican, 130  
 of 1812, 64  
 of Independence, 59  
 of Spanish Succession, 49  
 Persia and Gt. Britain, 138  
 Schleswig-Holstein, 146  
 Seven Weeks', 146  
 Seven Years', 50  
 Sonderbund, 138  
 Spanish-American, 168  
 Thirty Years', 45, 48  
 World, 90, 179, 203  
 Weavers, Irish, 42  
 Weinzoepflein, Fr., 125  
 West, migration to, 65  
 Westphalia, Peace of, 45  
 Whelan, Bishop, 152  
 Fr., 61  
 Wheeling, diocese, 132  
 visit of Bedini, 143  
 Wichita, diocese, 166  
 William III, of England, 41  
 I, of Germany, 147  
 Wilmington, diocese, 153  
 Windthorst, 158  
 Winona, diocese, 166  
 "Woolen tariff of 1828," 121  
 World's Fair, 139  
 World War, 90, 179, 203

Young, Bishop, 143  
 Young Ireland Party, 78

Zurich, Peace of, 86









Date Due

NOV 14 '62		
F 21 '48		
AP 2 - '40		
AP 3 - '46		
NOV 17 '59		
DEC 9 - '59		
DEC 4 - '50		
MAR 2 '2		
AUG 1 - '52		
JUN 1 - '52		
JUN 9 - '58		
DEC 2 - '58		
FEB 21 '59		
OCT 15 '62		
OCT 30 '62		

L. B. Cat. No. 1137

MARYGROVE COLLEGE LIBRARY  
Has the immigrant kept the faith  
277.3 Sh2



3 1927 00115146 0

277.3 Shaughnessy, Gerald

277.3

Sh2



